arXiv:0902.1738v1 [math.GR] 10 Feb 2009

A SOLVABLE VERSION OF THE BAER–SUZUKI THEOREM

SIMON GUEST

Abstract. Suppose that G is a finite group and $x \in G$ has prime order $p \geq 5$. Then x is contained in the solvable radical of G, $O_\infty(G)$, if (and only if) $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is solvable for all $g \in G$. If G is an almost simple group and $x \in G$ has prime order $p \geq 5$ then this implies that there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is not solvable. In fact, this is also true when $p = 3$ with very few exceptions, which are described explicitly.

1. Introduction

The Baer–Suzuki theorem provides a useful characterization of the Fitting subgroup of a finite (or linear) group. It can be stated as follows:

Theorem 1. (Baer–Suzuki) *Let G be a finite (or linear) group. Suppose that for some $x \in G$, $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is nilpotent for all $g \in G$. Then $\langle x^G\rangle$ is nilpotent. That is, x is contained in the Fitting subgroup of G.*

It is natural to ask if there is an analogous result if the nilpotency condition is replaced with solvability. However, it is easy to find counterexamples. For example, any two involutions generate a dihedral group. So if G is a non-abelian simple group and x is an involution in G then $\langle x^G\rangle = G$ is not solvable yet $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is solvable for all $g \in G$.

There are also counterexamples when x has order 3. Suppose that $x \in SL(n, 3)$ ($n \geq 3$) has order 3 and acts trivially on some hyperplane; that is, x is a transvection. Then x and any conjugate x^g generate a group that acts trivially on a subspace of codimension at most 2. Thus $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is solvable since it has a normal abelian subgroup N such that $\langle x, x^g\rangle/N$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $GL(2, 3)$. However, since x is not central, it is not contained in the solvable radical of $SL(n, 3)$ and $\langle x^G\rangle$ is not solvable. The aim is to prove the following:

Theorem A. *Let G be a finite group. Suppose that $x \in G$ has prime order $p \geq 5$. If $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is solvable for all $g \in G$ then $\langle x^G\rangle$ is solvable. Equivalently, if $x \notin O_\infty(G)$ then there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is not solvable.*

It is worth noting that Theorem A implies the following result:

Corollary 1. *Let G be a finite (or linear) group. Then G is solvable if and only if any two conjugates generate a solvable group.*

Proof. Let G be a minimal counterexample to the version of the theorem for finite groups. Thus G is a finite simple group by minimality and therefore G contains an element x of prime order $p \geq 5$. So Theorem A implies that there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is not solvable and thus G is not a minimal counterexample. The version of the theorem for linear groups follows from the finite group version using a standard argument (see [FGG, Corollary 1.2] for example). □

Also note that a minimal counterexample in Theorem 1 must be one of the minimal simple groups described by Thompson in the N-group paper [Tho68]. Thus one could prove Theorem 1 without relying on the full Classification theorem by ruling out all of the minimal simple groups.

Theorem A is also used in [FGG] to prove:

Theorem 2. *Let G be a finite or linear group. Then $x \in G$ is contained in the solvable radical of G if and only if $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2}, x^{g_3} \rangle$ is solvable for all $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$.*

The proof in [FGG] relies on the Classification of Finite Simple Groups, however a weaker version of the theorem for finite groups is also given in [FGG] that does not rely on the Classification theorem:

Theorem 3. *Let G be a finite group. Then $x \in G$ is contained in the solvable radical of G if and only if every 7 conjugates of x generate a solvable group.*

Theorems 2 and 3 were announced in [GPS07] (see Theorems 7.3 and 7.4). Furthermore, Theorem A and Theorem 2 have been obtained independently in [GGKP08b] and [GGKP08a], also using the Classification theorem.

2. Reduction

Lemma 1 below simplifies matters considerably. It reduces the proof to a situation where G is an almost simple group.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that G is a finite group such that the Fitting subgroup $F(G)$ is trivial. Let L be a component of G.*
(a) *If x is an element of G such that $x \notin N_G(L)$ and $x^2 \notin C_G(L)$ then there exists an element g in G such that $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ is not solvable.*
(b) *If x is an element of G such that $x \notin N_G(L)$ and $x^2 \in C_G(L)$ then there exist elements g_1 and g_2 in G such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2} \rangle$ is not solvable.*

Proof. Write $E(G)$ for the subgroup of G generated by its components. Then the generalized Fitting subgroup is $F^*(G) = E(G)F(G)$. Since $F(G) = 1$, it follows that $Z(F^*(G)) = Z(E(G))$ is a normal abelian subgroup of G and is therefore trivial. Also, $Z(E(G))$ is generated by the centers of each component of G and so all of the components of G are simple. Moreover, $E(G)$ must be a direct product of the components of G. So G is embedded in $\mathrm{Aut}(F^*(G)) = \mathrm{Aut}(E(G))$. It suffices to assume that $G = \langle L, x \rangle$. Thus if $t := |\{L^{x^i} : \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots\}|$ then $E(G) = L \times \cdots \times L^{x^{t-1}}$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(E(G)) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(L) \wr S_t$. Since x does not normalize L, it follows that $t \geq 2$. Moreover, it suffices to assume that $x = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t)\tau$ where $\sigma_i \in \mathrm{Aut}(L^{x^{i-1}})$ and τ is the t-cycle $(12 \cdots t)$. Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(u_1,\dots,u_t)} &= (u_1, \dots, u_t)(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t)\tau(u_1, \dots, u_t)^{-1}\tau^{-1}\tau \\ &= (u_1, \dots, u_t)(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t)(u_t^{-1}, u_1^{-1}, \dots, u_{t-1}^{-1})\tau. \end{aligned}$$

So if

$$\begin{aligned} &u_t = 1, u_{t-1} = \sigma_t, u_{t-2} = (\sigma_t\sigma_{t-1}), u_{t-3} = (\sigma_t\sigma_{t-1}\sigma_{t-2}), \dots, \\ &u_1 = (\sigma_t\sigma_{t-1} \cdots \sigma_1). \end{aligned}$$

then $x^{(u_1,\dots,u_t)} = (y, 1, 1, \dots, 1)\tau$ for some $y \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$. Thus, it suffices to assume that x is of this form.
Now let $g := (w_1, \dots, w_t) \in \mathrm{Aut}(L) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{Aut}(L^{x^{t-1}})$ so that

$$x^{-1}(w_1, \dots, w_t)x(w_1^{-1}, \dots, w_t^{-1}) = (w_2w_1^{-1}, \dots)$$

and

$$(w_1, \dots, w_t)x(w_1, \dots, w_t)^{-1}x^{-1} = (w_1yw_t^{-1}y^{-1}, \dots)$$

First, suppose that $t \geq 3$. By [AG84, Theorem B], there exist l_1 and l_2 in L such that $L = \langle l_1, l_2 \rangle$. So define $w_1 = 1$, $w_2 = l_1$, and $w_t = y^{-1}l_2y$. Thus $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ contains $(l_1, \dots)$ and $(l_2, \dots)$ and is not solvable. If $t = 2$ and $x^2 \notin C_G(L)$, then $x = (y, 1)\tau$ and since $x^2 = (y, y)$, it follows that $y \neq 1$. Now

$\langle y, L\rangle$ is almost simple so by [GK00] there exists $z \in \langle y, L\rangle$ such that $\langle y, z\rangle$ contains L. Observe that there exists $l \in L$ such that $z = y^k l$. So define $w_1 := 1$ and $w_2 := l$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} x^{2k-1}x^{(w_1,w_2)} =&(y^k, y^{k-1})\tau(w_1, w_2)(y, 1)\tau(w_1^{-1}, w_2^{-1}) \\ =&(y^k w_2 w_1^{-1}, \cdot) = (z, \cdot) \end{aligned}$$

and so $\langle x, x^{(w_1,w_2)}\rangle$ cannot be solvable. This proves part (a).

To prove (b), suppose that x does not normalize L and $x^2 \in C_G(L)$. So it suffices to assume that $t = 2$ and $x = \tau$. If $g_1 := (1, l_1)$ and $g_2 := (1, l_2)$ then

$$x^{-1}x^{g_1} = (l_1, \cdot);\ x^{-1}x^{g_2} = (l_2, \cdot)$$

and thus $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2}\rangle$ is not solvable. This proves part (b) of Lemma 1. □

Lemma 2. *Suppose that (x, G) is a minimal counterexample. Then G is almost simple.*

Proof. Since (x, G) is a minimal counterexample, the solvable radical of G is trivial. Let N be a minimal normal subgroup. So $N \cong L \times \cdots \times L$ for some non-abelian simple group L. If $x \in N$ then $G = N$ since otherwise $\langle x^N\rangle$ would be a solvable normal subgroup of N, and N does not have any such subgroups. Thus, if $x \in N$ then G is simple since G has no non-trivial normal subgroups. Now assume that $x \notin N$ and let $H := \langle x, N\rangle$. If $G \neq H$ then $\langle x^H\rangle \cap N$ is a solvable normal subgroup of N and is thus trivial. Thus $[x, N] = 1$, which is not possible, because it would follow that $[\langle x^G\rangle, N] = 1$. Since N is a minimal normal subgroup, $\langle x^G\rangle \cap N$ would be trivial and thus $\langle (xN)^{G/N}\rangle \cong \langle x^G\rangle N/N \cong \langle x^G\rangle$. This is not possible since $\langle (xN)^{G/N}\rangle$ is solvable by minimality. So $G = H = \langle x, N\rangle$. Note that the Fitting subgroup of G is trivial since the solvable radical is trivial and thus x normalizes every component by Lemma 1. So L is normal in G, $N = L$ and $G = \langle x, L\rangle$. Now G is almost simple since L is the unique minimal normal subgroup of G. □

The Classification of Finite Simple Groups can be used to determine the possibilities for the socle G_0 of G, and thus eliminate each possibility case by case. In fact, the following theorem is slightly stronger and implies Theorem A.

Theorem A*. *Let G be a finite almost simple group with socle G_0. Suppose that x is an element of odd prime order in G. Then one of the following holds.*
(i) *There exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is not solvable.*
(ii) *$p = 3$ and (x, G_0) belongs to a short list of exceptions given in Table 1. Moreover, there exist $g_1, g_2 \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2}\rangle$ is not solvable, unless $G_0 \cong PSU(n, 2)$, $PSp(2n, 3)$. In any case, there exist $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2}, x^{g_3}\rangle$ is not solvable.*

Corollary 2. *Let G be an almost simple group, and suppose that $x \in G$ has prime order $p \geq 5$. Suppose that x is contained in the solvable radical of all proper subgroups M containing x. Then there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g\rangle = G$.*

Proof. By Theorem A*, there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is not solvable. If $\langle x, x^g\rangle \neq G$ then it is contained in some maximal subgroup M. However, the hypothesis implies that $x \in O_\infty(M)$ which would mean that $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ would be solvable. Thus $\langle x, x^g\rangle = G$. □

Clearly, we only need to check that the hypothesis in the corollary is true for all *maximal* subgroups. Indeed, if $x \in M$ and $M < M' < G$ then $\langle x^{M'}\rangle$ is solvable, therefore $\langle x^M\rangle$ is solvable and thus $x \in O_\infty(M)$.

G_0	x
$PSL(n,3)$, $n > 2$	transvection
$PSp(2n,3)$, $n > 1$	transvection
$PSU(n,3)$, $n > 2$	transvection
$PSU(n,2)$, $n > 3$	reflection of order 3
$P\Omega^{\epsilon}(n,3)$, $n > 6$	x a long root element
$E_l(3), F_4(3), {}^2E_6(3), {}^3D_4(3)$	x a long root element
$G_2(3)$	x a long or short root element
$G_2(2)' \cong PSU(3,3)$	transvection

Table 1. List of exceptions to Theorem A*

3. Preliminaries

Let $\overline{G}$ be a simple classical algebraic group of adjoint type over the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}_q$. Let σ be a Frobenius morphism of $\overline{G}$ such that $\overline{G}_\sigma := \{g \in \overline{G} \,:\, g^\sigma = g\}$ is a finite almost simple classical group over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Write G_0 for the socle of $\overline{G}_\sigma$ and note that $\overline{G}_\sigma$ is the group $\mathrm{Inndiag}(G_0)$ of inner diagonal automorphisms of G_0. A collection of lemmas, definitions, and theorems are listed below, which will be very useful in the sequel:

Lemma 3. *Let $x \in \overline{G}_\sigma$ have odd prime order r. Define $(G, \hat{G})$ as follows:*

G_0	$PSL^{\epsilon}_n(q)$	$PSp_n(q)$	$P\Omega^{\epsilon}_n(q)$
$(G,\hat{G})$	$(\overline{G}_\sigma, GL^{\epsilon}_n(q))$	$(G_0, Sp_n(q))$	$(G_0, \Omega^{\epsilon}_n(q))$

(a) *Then one of the following holds:*

(i) *x lifts to an element $\hat{x} \in \hat{G}$ of order r such that $|x^G| = |\hat{x}^{\hat{G}}|$;*

(ii) *$G_0 = PSL^{\epsilon}_n(q)$, $r \mid \gcd(q-\epsilon, n)$ and x is $\overline{G}$-conjugate to $[I_{\frac{n}{r}}, \omega I_{\frac{n}{r}}, \ldots, \omega^{r-1} I_{\frac{n}{r}}]$ where ω is a primitive rth root of unity.*

(b) *If $r \nmid q$ then $x^{G_0} = x^{\overline{G}_\sigma}$.*

Proof. See [Bur04, 3.11] and [GLS98, 4.2.2(j)] □

Definition 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of pairs (x, H) such that:*

- (i) *x is an element of odd prime order contained in a group H;*
- (ii) *$H/O_\infty(H)$ is almost simple;*
- (iii) *x is not contained in $O_\infty(H)$;*
- (iv) *$(x, H/O_\infty(H))$ is not one of the examples in Table 1.*

Lemma 4. (a) *If $x \in G$ is an inner-diagonal automorphism of G_0 and $|x^{G_0}| = |x^{\overline{G}_\sigma}|$ then it suffices to take $G = \overline{G}_\sigma$.*

(b) *If y is some $Aut(G_0)$-conjugate of x and there exists $l \in G_0$ such that $\langle y, y^l\rangle$ is not solvable then there exists $l' \in G_0$ such that $\langle x, x^{l'}\rangle$ is not solvable.*

(c) *If x is contained in H, a proper subgroup of G, and $(x, H) \in \mathcal{A}$ then G cannot be a minimal counterexample to Theorem A*.*

Proof. (a) Suppose that the theorem is true for $\overline{G}_\sigma$. If x is contained in G then $x \in \overline{G}_\sigma$ and so there exists $g \in \overline{G}_\sigma$ such that $\langle x^g, x\rangle$ is not solvable. But then there exists $g_1 \in G_0$ such that $x^{g_1} = x^g$ by the condition.

(b) Suppose that $y = x^g$ for some $g \in Aut(G_0)$. Then $\langle y, y^l\rangle^{g^{-1}} = \langle x, y^{lg^{-1}}\rangle = \langle x, x^{l'}\rangle$ since

$lg^{-1} = g^{-1}glg^{-1} = g^{-1}l'$.
(c) Trivial. ☐

Lemma 5. *Let $X_1, \dots X_k$ be representatives for the conjugacy classes of maximal subgroups containing x. Let n_i be the number of conjugates of X_i that contain x. If*

$$|x^G|^2 > \sum_i n_i|x^G \cap X_i| = \sum |x^G \cap X_i|^2[G : X_i].$$

then there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g\rangle = G$

Proof. Let $X_{i1}, \dots, X_{in_i}$ be the conjugates of X_i that contain x. The aim is to show that x^G cannot be contained in $\cup_{i,j}X_{ij}$, since this proves the lemma. It is not hard to show that $n_i/[G : X_i] = |x^G \cap X_i|/|x^G|$. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|x^G \cap \cup_{i,j}X_{ij}| &\leq \sum_i n_i|x^G \cap X_i|\\ &= \sum |x^G \cap X_i|^2[G : X_i]/|x^G|\end{aligned}$$

and so if x^G were contained in $\cup_{i,j}X_{ij}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}|x^G| = |x^G \cap \cup_{i,j}X_{ij}| &\leq \sum_i n_i|x^G \cap X_i|\\ &= \sum |x^G \cap X_i|^2[G : X_i]/|x^G|.\end{aligned}$$

However, this implies that

$$|x^G|^2 \leq \sum_i n_i|x^G \cap X_i| = \sum |x^G \cap X_i|^2[G : X_i],$$

which contradicts the hypothesis. ☐

Remark If

$$|G|/|C_G(x)|^2 > \sum_i |x^G \cap X_i|$$

then the conclusion of the theorem holds.

Lemma 6. *Let G_0 be a simple group of Lie type and suppose that G satisfies $G_0 \trianglelefteq G \leq \mathrm{Inndiag(G_0)}$.*
(i) *Suppose that $x \in G$ is unipotent and P_1 and P_2 are distinct maximal parabolic subgroups containing a common Borel subgroup, with unipotent radicals U_1 and U_2 respectively. Then there exists $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that x is G-conjugate to an element of $P_i\backslash U_i$.*
(ii) *Suppose that $x \in G$ is semisimple and is contained in a parabolic subgroup of G. Suppose further that the Lie rank of G_0 is at least 2. Then there exists a maximal parabolic subgroup P with a Levi complement J such that x is conjugate to an element of J not centralized by any component of J.*

Proof. See [GS03, Lemma 2.2]. ☐

Theorem 4. *Let G be an almost simple group and let $x \in G$ with $x \neq 1$. If $x^G \subseteq M_1 \cup M_2$ for subgroups M_1 and M_2 of G then G_0 is contained in M_i for $i = 1$ or 2.*

Proof. See [Gur98, Theorem 2.1]. ☐

To begin the proof of Theorem A*, let (x, G) be a minimal counterexample. Then G is almost simple with socle G_0. If $p \geq 5$ then Theorem A holds for any group containing fewer elements than G.

4. Alternating Groups

Suppose that $G_0 = A_n$. Then x is contained in A_n since it has odd order. Firstly, consider the case where $p \geq 5$. The cycle structure of x will consist only of p-cycles. So it suffices to assume that $x = (12\dots p)\sigma$ for some $\sigma \in \mathrm{Alt}\{p+1, \dots, n\}$. Observe that if $g := (123)$ then $xgx^{-1}g^{-1} = (2p3)$. Thus $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ contains $\mathrm{Alt}\{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ since a primitive permutation group of degree $p \geq 5$ containing a 3-cycle contains A_p (see [Wie64, Theorem 13.9] for example). So (x, G) cannot be a counterexample in this case.

Now suppose that $p = 3$. Then the cycle structure of x consists of only 3-cycles. If x is the product of more than one 3-cycle then it suffices to assume that $G = A_6$ and x is the product of two 3-cycles. But then x is conjugate to a 3-cycle in $\mathrm{Aut}(A_6)$. Thus we may assume that x is a 3-cycle in A_5 and without loss of generality, that $x = (123)$. If $g := (14253)$ then $x^g = (451)$. Thus, $xx^g = (12345)$ and $\langle x, x^g \rangle \cong A_5$.

5. $PSL(n, q)$

If $G_0 \cong PSL(n, q)$ then it is convenient to treat the cases where $n = 2$ and $n \geq 3$ separately.

5.1. $G_0 \cong PSL(2, q)$.

Suppose that x is in $\mathrm{Inndiag}(PSL(2, q)) \cong PGL(2, q)$. Since x has odd order, it must lie in $PSL(2, q)$.

5.1.1. $x \in \mathrm{Inndiag}(PSL(2, q))$ *and* $p \mid q$.

If $p \mid q$ and $p \geq 5$ then it suffices to assume that x is contained in $PSL(2, p)$. Consider the possibilities for the maximal subgroups of $PSL(2, p)$ containing $\langle x, x^g \rangle$, which are described in [GLS98, Theorem 6.5.1]. By the order of x and since (x, G) is a minimal counterexample, the only type of maximal subgroup possible is a Borel subgroup, B. Now since $p \mid q$, x and x^g must lie inside the kernel K of B which is (elementary) abelian. So any p-elements lying in a common Borel subgroup must commute. Thus, since there must exist a conjugate of x that does not commute with x—otherwise $[x^G, x^G] = 1$ and G_0 would be abelian—there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g \rangle = PSL(2, p)$, which is not solvable for $p \geq 5$.

If $p = 3$ then $q = 3^a$, where $a > 1$ and since $x \in PSL(2, q)$, it suffices to assume that $G = PSL(2, q)$. Now $A_6 \cong PSL(2, 9)$ so let us assume that $q > 9$. If $q = 3^a$ and a is not prime then there exists a conjugate x^g of x that is contained in a subfield subgroup H with (x^g, H) in $\mathcal{A}$. So a must be an odd prime. Now we may assume that

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

There are two classes of transvections in G, and since -1 is not a square in $\mathbb{F}_q$, x and x^{-1} are not conjugate. Thus if we let

$$y := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ s & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

then x or x^{-1} is conjugate to y. So there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ contains

$$xy = \begin{pmatrix} 1+s & 1 \\ s & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is semisimple and has trace $s + 2$. In particular we can choose s so that xy has order $\frac{q+1}{2}$ and an inspection of the maximal subgroups of G shows that $\langle x, x^g \rangle = G$.

5.1.2. $x \in \mathrm{Inndiag}(PSL(2,q))$ *and* $p \nmid q$. Suppose now that $p \nmid q$. Then either $p \mid q-1$ or $p \mid q+1$. If $p \mid q-1$ then x is contained in a split torus. Examining the character table of $PSL(2,q)$ shows that for an element z of order $(q+1)/(2,q-1)$,

$$\sum_{\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G_0)} \frac{\overline{\chi(z)}|\chi(x)|^2}{\chi(1)} \neq 0$$

so there exists $g \in G$ such that $[x,g]$ has order $(q+1)/(2,q-1)$. That is $[x,g]$ generates a non-split torus. It follows that $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ generates $PSL(2,q)$. Indeed, $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ contains an irreducible torus, and it also contains x, which does not normalize this torus. An inspection of the maximal subgroups of $PSL(2,q)$ yields that $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ must generate the whole group for $q \geq 11$, and $q = 8$. It suffices to assume that $q \neq 4$, 5 or 9 since in those cases G is isomorphic to an alternating group. When $q = 7$, the normalizer of a non-split torus is not maximal, but is contained in subgroups isomorphic to S_4. However, since $p \mid q-1$, $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ cannot be contained in S_4 since S_4 does not contain two elements of order 3 whose product has order 4.

If $p \mid q+1$ then the character table implies that there exists $g \in G$ such that $[x,g]$ has order $(q-1)/(2,q-1)$. Thus $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ contains a split torus, and since $p \mid q+1$, it acts irreducibly. Therefore, an inspection of the maximal subgroups shows that for $q \geq 13$ and $q = 8$, $\langle x, x^g \rangle = PSL(2,q)$. Again, the cases when $q = 4$, 5, and 9 do not concern us. Also note that $q \neq 7$ since $p \mid q+1$. If $q = 11$ then $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ contains a maximal split torus and acts irreducibly. The list of maximal subgroups then implies that either $\langle x, x^g \rangle = PSL(2,q)$ or A_5. There are no other possibilities for $x \in \mathrm{Inndiag}(\mathrm{PSL}(2,q))$.

5.1.3. x *an outer automorphism of* $PSL(2,q)$. Suppose that x is not contained in $\mathrm{Inndiag}(\mathrm{G}_0)$. Then by [GL83, 7.2], and since x has odd order, there exists an element $g \in PGL(2,q)$ such that x^g is a standard field automorphism. So it suffices to assume that x is a standard field automorphism by Lemma 4, and moreover, that $G = \langle G_0, x \rangle$. Write $q = q_1^p$ and consider the set $\Gamma = \{y \in x^{G_0} | \langle x, y \rangle \neq G\}$. The aim is to bound the cardinality of Γ and show that this is smaller than $|x^{G_0}|$. Now if $y \in \Gamma$ then consider the possibilities for subgroups H of G_0 containing $\langle x, y \rangle \cap G_0$. Observe that $\langle x, y \rangle \cap G_0$ cannot be dihedral. Indeed, since a dihedral group has a characteristic cyclic subgroup of index 2, K say, K would be normal in $\langle x, y \rangle$. Now $\langle x, y \rangle / K$ has a normal subgroup of order 2 and a subgroup of order p, which is normal since it has index 2. So, $\langle x, y \rangle / K$ is abelian of order $2p$, but this is impossible since it is generated by two elements of order p. Thus, it suffices to assume that H is a Borel subgroup, a cyclic group of order $(q+1)/(2,q-1)$, or a subfield subgroup. Since p is odd any A_5 or S_4 will be contained in a subfield subgroup and any cyclic group of order $(q-1)/(2,q-1)$ will be contained in a Borel subgroup. Now let H be a Borel, non-split torus or subfield subgroup of the form $L(2, q^{1/r})$, where r is a prime distinct from p. Observe that we may assume that there are no subfield subgroups of the form $L(2, q^{1/r})$, $(r \neq p)$ since some conjugate of x will be a non-trivial field automorphism of the simple subgroup $L(2, q^{1/r})$ contradicting the minimality of (x, G). Now the conjugates of H fixed by x form one $C_{G_0}(x)$ orbit. This follows from the fact that any two conjugates of x in $H\langle x \rangle$ are in fact conjugate by an element of H, which is a consequence of Lang's Theorem (see [GL83, 7.2]). So if k is the number of conjugates of H fixed by x then

$$\begin{aligned} |\{y \in x^{G_0} : \langle x, y \rangle \cap G_0 \text{ is contained in a conjugate of } H\}| &\leq |x^H|.k \\ &= \frac{|H||C_{G_0}(x)|}{|C_H(x)|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover x does not fix any non-trivial conjugate of $C_{G_0}(x) = PSL(2, q^{1/p})$, so

$$|\{y \in x^{G_0} : \langle x, y \rangle \cap G_0 \text{ is contained in some conjugate of } C_{G_0}(x)\}| \leq |C_{G_0}(x)|.$$

Therefore if the representatives for the conjugacy classes of the subgroups above are denoted by H_1, … , H_m, $H_{m+1} := C_{G_0}(x)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}|\Gamma| &= |\{y \in x^{G_0} : G_0 \cap \langle x, y\rangle \text{ is contained in some conjugate of some } H_i\}| \\ &\le |C_{G_0}(x)| + \sum_{i=1}^{m} |H_i||C_{G_0}(x)|/|C_{H_i}(x)|^2.\end{aligned}$$

If $q_0 := q^{1/p}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}|H||C_{G_0}(x)|/|C_H(x)|^2 &= (q_0^p + 1)q_0(q_0^2 - 1)/(q_0 + 1)^2 \\ &= (q_0^p + 1)q_0(q_0 - 1)/(q_0 + 1)\end{aligned}$$

when H is a non-split torus. Similarly if H is a Borel subgroup then

$$|H||C_{G_0}(x)|/|C_H(x)|^2 = q_0^p(q_0^p - 1)(q_0 + 1)/q_0(q_0 - 1)$$

So,

$$|\Gamma| \le q_0(q_0^2 - 1) + \frac{q_0^p(q_0^p - 1)(q_0 + 1)}{q_0(q_0 - 1)} + \frac{(q_0^p + 1)q_0(q_0 - 1)}{(q_0 + 1)}$$

However, $|x^{G_0}| = |G_0|/|C_{G_0}(x)| = \frac{q_0^p(q_0^{2p}-1)}{q_0(q_0^2-1)}$ and $q \ge 8$ so it follows that $|x^{G_0}| > |\Gamma|$ as required. Thus, if x is an outer automorphism of $PSL(2, q)$ then (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

6. Outer Automorphisms

If (x, G) is a minimal counterexample and x is an outer automorphism of G_0 then the work for $G_0 = PSL(2, q)$ allows a considerable narrowing of the possibilities for G_0. This is demonstrated in Lemma 7 below.

Lemma 7. *If x is an outer automorphism of G_0 that is not inner-diagonal and (x, G) is a minimal counterexample then G_0 is a Suzuki–Ree group.*

Proof. Since $x \notin \mathrm{Inndiag(G_0)}$ and x has odd prime order, either x is a field automorphism or, $G_0 \cong D_4(q)$ or ${}^3D_4(q)$ and x is a graph or graph-field automorphism. Since the case where $G_0 \cong PSL(2, q)$ has already been eliminated the Lie rank is at least 2. If x is a field automorphism then by [GL83, 7.2] and Lemma 4 it suffices to assume that x is a standard field automorphism. So if G_0 is not a Suzuki–Ree group then x will act non-trivially as a field automorphism on a fundamental SL_2-subgroup, by [GLS98, Theorem 3.2.8]. So (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

If $G_0 \cong {}^3D_4(q)$ and x is a graph automorphism of order 3 then [GL83, 9.1] describes the conjugacy classes of such elements. Let γ be the standard triality automorphism and $g = \overline{h_{\beta_0}(\omega)}$ where ω is a primitive cube root of unity and β_0 is the γ invariant fundamental root. Thus, if $3 \nmid q$ then it suffices to assume that x is either γ or $g\gamma$. Also, if $3 \mid q$ then it suffices to assume that x is either γ or $x_\beta(1)\gamma$ where β is the highest root. In all cases, x normalizes the maximal parabolic corresponding to β_0. Moreover x acts non-trivially on the Levi complement in all these cases and so (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. The only case left is where $G_0 \cong D_4(q)$ and x is a graph or field-graph automorphism of order 3. In which case, using [GL83], it suffices to assume that x is either the standard triality (and $C_{G_0}(x) = G_2(q)$) or it normalizes but does not centralize a subgroup isomorphic to $G_2(q)$. In the latter case x induces a non-trivial automorphism on $G_2(q)$, so (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. In the former case, since $G_2(q)$ does not contain a Sylow 3-subgroup, x normalizes more than one conjugate of $G_2(q)$. Since it only centralizes one $G_2(q)$ subgroup, it follows that x induces a non-trivial automorphism on some subgroup isomorphic to $G_2(q)$ and so (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. □

7. $PSL(n,q)$, $n \geq 3$

7.1. $x \in PGL(n,q)$, $p \nmid q$, $n \geq 3$. Now suppose that (x,G) is a minimal counterexample with $G_0 = PSL(n,q)$ and $n \geq 3$.

Lemma 8. *For $n \geq 3$, if one can lift x to an element of order p in $GL(n,q)$ and x does not act irreducibly then (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.*

Proof. Suppose that one can lift x to an element of $GL(n,q)$ order p. Now the minimal polynomial $m_x(t)$ of x divides (t^p-1) so suppose that $(t^p-1)/(t-1)$ factors into irreducibles $g_1(t)\dots g_k(t)$. Then each non-linear $g_i(t)$ is the minimal polynomial of some primitive pth root of unity ζ_p. Thus

$$\mathrm{deg\ g_i(t) = [\mathbb{F}_q(\zeta_p) : \mathbb{F}_q]}.$$

But $\mathbb{F}_q(\zeta_p)$ is just the finite field of q^e elements where e is the smallest positive integer such that $p \mid q^e - 1$. So all of the $g_i(t)$'s have degree e. Now $m_x(t)$ is a product of some $g_i(t)$'s and possibly $t-1$. By considering the rational canonical form of x, it is clear that there is an e-dimensional subspace U of V on which x acts invariantly, non-trivially and irreducibly. If $2 \leq e < n$ then consider the induced transformation of U, x_U so that $x_U \in GL(e,q)$. Now observe that if $(e,q) \neq (2,2)$ or $(2,3)$ then $(x_U, GL(e,q)) \in \mathcal{A}$. If $(e,q) = (2,3)$ then p would be 2. So the only case of concern is $(e,q) = (2,2)$ and then for $n \geq 4$ one can just reduce to the case where $G_0 = PSL(4,2)$. However $PSL(4,2) \cong A_8$ and $PSL(3,2) \cong PSL(2,7)$, which have already been eliminated. If $e = 1$ then since $p \mid q-1$, $q \geq 4$. Now x will act non trivially on a 2 dimensional subspace U'; thus $x_{U'} \in GL(2,q)$ and $(x_{U'}, GL(2,q)) \in \mathcal{A}$. So unless $e = n \geq 3$, (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. □

Now observe that the proof above shows that if $(x, PGL(n,q))$ is a minimal counterexample and x lifts to an element of order p in $GL(n,q)$ then p is a primitive prime divisor of q^n-1 and x acts irreducibly. Also, if x acts irreducibly and n is not prime then some conjugate of x is contained in a field extension subgroup $PGL(\frac{n}{r}, q^r)$. Thus, if $(x, PGL(n,q))$ is a minimal counterexample then n is prime.

The results in [GPPS99] state that any subgroup of $GL(n,q)$ which has order divisible by a primitive prime divisor of q^e-1 must be one of nine types (2.1–2.9). The results of [GPPS99] will be used frequently, and are summarized in Table 2. The notation of [GPPS99] will be used. Namely, that the element of $GL(d,q)$ that is a primitive prime divisor of q^e-1 be referred to as a ppd(d,q,e)-element. The only elements that are of interest are ppd(n,q,n)-elements where n is (an odd) prime. So what are the possibilities for a maximal subgroup M of $GL(n,q)$ containing x?

Lemma 9. *Suppose that x is a ppd(n,q,n)-element contained in a subgroup M of G, where G is a classical group of dimension $n \geq 3$ and (x,G) is a minimal counterexample. Then $p \geq 5$ and M cannot be of type* 2.2*,* 2.3*,* 2.4*(a),* 2.6*,* 2.7*,* 2.8*, or* 2.9*.*

Proof. Firstly, if $p = 3$ then since $p \nmid q$, Fermat's Little Theorem implies that $p \mid q^2-1$, thus p cannot be a primitive prime divisor of q^n-1 for $n \geq 3$. If G is a classical group then $M \leq G \leq GL(n,q)$ for some q, and so M must be one the examples in [GPPS99]. All of the subgroups M of type 2.6–2.9 are almost simple modulo scalars so it suffices to check that $(x, M/(M\cap Z)) \in \mathcal{A}$. If M is of type 2.6 or 2.7 then $F^*(M/(M\cap Z)) \cong A_d$ for some d, or a sporadic group and so $(x, M/(M \cap Z)) \in \mathcal{A}$. The only ppd($n$,$q$,$n$)-elements in type 2.8 examples $(M/(M\cap Z)) \in Lie(q_0)$ are with $M^{(\infty)} = G_2(q_1)$, $q_0 = 2$ and $M^{(\infty)} = {}^2B_2(q_1)$, $q_0 = 2$ but these occurrences must all lie in $\mathcal{A}$. Similarly, all of the type 2.9 subgroups in [GPPS99, Tables 7 and 8] coincide with elements of $\mathcal{A}$. Since x acts irreducibly it cannot be contained in a reducible subgroup of type 2.2 and it cannot be contained in a type 2.3 example since these are only examples for ppd(d,q,e)-elements where $e+1 \leq d$. Similarly x cannot be contained in a 2.4(a) type subgroup since these are only examples for ppd(d,q,e)-elements where $e+1 = d$. □

Type	Rough description	Conditions on d, q, e
Classical (2.1(a))	$SL(d, q_0) \trianglelefteq M$	p a ppd(q_0,d,e)-element
Classical (2.1(b))	$Sp(d, q_0) \trianglelefteq M$	d, e both even; p a ppd(q_0,d,e)-element
Classical (2.1(c))	$SU(d, q_0) \trianglelefteq M$	q_0 a square; e odd; p a ppd(q_0,d,e)-element
Classical (2.1(d))	$\Omega^\epsilon(d, q_0) \trianglelefteq M$	$\epsilon = \pm$ when d even; $\epsilon = 0$ when dq is odd; e even; p a ppd(q_0,d,e)-element
Reducible (2.2)	M reducible	
Imprimitive (2.3)	$M \leq GL(1, q)$ wr $\mathrm{S_d}$	$p = e + 1 \leq d$
Extension Field (2.4(a))	$M \leq GL(1, q^d).d$	$p = d = e + 1$
Extension Field (2.4(b))	$M \leq GL(d/b, q^b).b$	$b \mid \gcd(d, e)$
Symplectic type (2.5)		$d = 2^a$; q odd not a square; $p = d + 1 = e + 1$ or $p = d - 1 = e + 1$
Nearly simple (2.6–2.9)	$M/(M \cap Z)$ simple	Possibilities listed in tables in [GPPS99]

TABLE 2. Summary of descriptions in [GPPS99] of subgroup types containing ppd(d,q,e)-elements

Suppose that x is contained in a classical example of type 2.1. By [KL90] and [GPPS99], since $n \geq 3$, all of the classical examples containing ppd(n,q,n)-elements are almost simple modulo scalars. So if x is contained in a type 2.1 subgroup M then (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample since $p \geq 5$. The symplectic type examples (2.5) only occur as subgroups of $GL(2^a, q)$ but it is assumed that n is an odd prime. Therefore, the only possibilities for subgroups M containing x are the extension field examples of type (2.4(b)). Since n is prime, M must be of type $GL(1, q^n).n$. Moreover, if $p \mid n$ then $p = n$ since n is prime. However, $p \nmid q^p - 1$ so $p \nmid n$. Thus, x must lie inside the Singer cycle $GL(1, q^n)$. Furthermore, $C_{GL(n,q)}(x) = GL(1, q^n)$, thus x can only lie in one such maximal subgroup and applying Theorem 4 yields that (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

Lemma 10. *If x does not lift to an element of order p in $GL(n, q)$ then (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.*

Proof. Suppose that x does not lift to an element of order p in $GL(n, q)$. Now x^p is central so x satisfies the polynomial $p(t) := t^p - \lambda$. Now $p(t)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_q$. For $p \mid (q - 1)$, since x does not lift, thus any field containing a root α of $p(t)$ would be a splitting field for $p(t)$. So the degree of any irreducible factor of $p(t)$ is the degree of the splitting field extension over $\mathbb{F}_q$. However, $p(t)$ has prime degree and so it is either irreducible or it splits completely. It cannot split completely otherwise λ would have pth roots and x would lift to an element of order p. Thus, the irreducible module for $\langle x \rangle$ has dimension p and so it suffices to deal with case where $n = p$. So let v be a vector in V and consider the action of x on v. The vectors $v, xv, x^2v, \ldots, (x^{p-1})v$ form a basis for V since x acts irreducibly. Moreover $x^pv = \lambda v$. So x is contained in a subgroup of type $GL(1, q) \wr S_p$ and x acts as a p-cycle in the S_p. So for $p \geq 5$, we have shown that (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. Now suppose that $p = 3$. Then it suffices to assume that x has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \lambda \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Now let $t^2 - \mu_2 t - \mu_1$ be an irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$, such that $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mu_1 \\ 1 & \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}$ has order $q^2 - 1$. Now x is conjugate to

$$y := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\mu_1^{-1}\lambda \\ 0 & \mu_1 & \mu_2^{-1}(\mu_1^{-1}\lambda - \mu_1^2) \\ 1 & \mu_2 & -\mu_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and therefore

$$x^{-1}y := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mu_1 & \mu_2^{-1}(\mu_1^{-1}\lambda - \mu_1^2) \\ 1 & \mu_2 & -\mu_1 \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

has order a multiple of $q^2 - 1$. Thus, by [GLS98, Theorem 6.5.3], $\langle x, y \rangle$ is not solvable and hence (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. The case where $p \mid q$ is considered in the next section.

8. Unipotent elements

Lemma 11. *Suppose that* G_0 *is a simple group of Lie type and suppose that* $x \in G_0$ *is unipotent of order* p*. If* G_0 *is defined over* $\mathbb{F}_q$ *and* $q \neq 3$ *then* (x, G) *cannot be minimal counterexample unless* $G_0 = PSU(3, q)$ *or* ${}^2G_2(q)$*.*

Proof. The case where $G_0 = PSL(2, q)$ has already been done. Since p is an odd prime, $G_0 \neq {}^2B_2(q)$ or ${}^2F_4(q)$. In the remaining cases, by Lemma 6, for any two maximal parabolic subgroups P_1 and P_2 (containing a common Borel subgroup) there exists a conjugate of x that is contained in $P_i \backslash U_i$ for either $i = 1$ or 2. The parabolic subgroups can be chosen so that the Levi complement has only one component, and since $q \geq 5$, it will always be almost simple. It follows that since $(xU_i, P_i/U_i)$ will be contained in $\mathcal{A}$, (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. Table 3 describes the parabolic subgroups to choose and the possibilities for the Levi complement. ☐

The next lemma also eliminates the possibility that $q = 3$ for classical groups.

Lemma 12. *If* x *is an element of order* 3 *in a classical group* G *defined over* $\mathbb{F}_3$ *then* (x, G) *cannot be a minimal counterexample.*

Proof. The aim is to show that if x is not a long root element then, unless the dimension of the natural module V is very small, there exists a subgroup H such that (x, H) is in $\mathcal{A}$. By [Wal63, pp.34–38], if x is an element of order 3 in a classical group over $\mathbb{F}_3$ then x will nearly always fix an orthogonal decomposition unless n is very small. Suppose that x has order 3 in $SL(n, 3)$ with $n \geq 5$. Then there exists x-invariant subspaces U and W such that $V = U \oplus W$. Without loss of generality, it suffices to assume that the dimension of U, k say, is at least 3 and x acts non trivially on U. Suppose that x does not act as a transvection on V. If x does not act as a transvection on U then (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. So assume that x acts a transvection on U. Then x must act non-trivially on W. So the dimension of W, $n - k$, is at least 2 and it suffices to assume that x acts as a transvection on W also, but since $n \geq 5$ there is a four dimensional subspace U' on which x acts invariantly and is not a transvection and so $x_{U'}$ is contained in a subgroup of type $GL(4, 3)$. Now suppose that x is contained in a symplectic group $Sp(n, 3)$ and that x is not a symplectic transvection. If $n \geq 8$ then x fixes an orthogonal decomposition $U \perp W$. It suffices to assume that x acts non-trivially on both U and W otherwise (x, G) is not a minimal

G_0	Nodes corresponding to P_1 and P_2 (Bourbaki notation used where node is specified)	Levi complement type
$A_l(q)$, $l \geq 2$	end nodes	$A_{l-1}(q)$
$B_2(q)$	end nodes	$A_1(q)$
$B_l(q)$, $l \geq 3$	end nodes	$B_{l-1}(q)$, $A_{l-1}(q)$
$C_l(q)$, $l \geq 3$	end nodes	$C_{l-1}(q)$, $A_{l-1}(q)$
$D_4(q)$	any 2 end nodes	$A_3(q)$
$D_l(q)$, $l \geq 5$	any 2 end nodes	$D_{l-1}(q)$, $A_{l-1}(q)$
${}^2A_l(q)$, $l \geq 3$, l odd	end and middle node	$A_{(l-1)/2}(q^2)$, ${}^2A_{l-2}(q)$
${}^2A_l(q)$, $l \geq 4$, l even	end and middle node	${}^2A_{l-2}(q)$, $A_{(l-2)/2}(q^2)$
${}^2D_4(q)$,	end nodes	${}^2A_3(q)$, $A_2(q)$
${}^2D_l(q)$, $l \geq 5$	end nodes	${}^2D_{l-1}(q)$, $A_{l-2}(q)$
$E_6(q)$	nodes 1 and 6	$D_5(q)$
$E_7(q)$	nodes 1 and 2	$D_6(q)$, $A_6(q)$
$E_8(q)$	nodes 1 and 2	$D_7(q)$, $A_7(q)$
$F_4(q)$	end nodes	$B_3(q)$, $C_3(q)$
$G_2(q)$	end nodes	$A_1(q)$
${}^2E_6(q)$	end nodes	${}^2D_4(q)$, ${}^2A_5(q)$

TABLE 3. Maximal parabolic subgroups and their Levi complements used in Lemma 11

counterexample. Moreover, it suffices to assume that x acts as a symplectic transvection on U and on W, otherwise we $(x_U, Sp(U))$ or $(x_W, Sp(W))$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}$. So assume that for all $u \in U$ and all $w \in W$

$$x_U : u \to u + \lambda \kappa_U(u, a)a,\ a \in U, \kappa(a, a) = 0;$$

$$x_W : w \to w + \lambda' \kappa_W(w, b)b,\ b \in W, \kappa(b, b) = 0.$$

Choose $u \in U$ such that $\kappa_U(u, a) \neq 0$ and $w \in W$ such that $\kappa_W(w, b) \neq 0$. Then x acts invariantly on the non-degenerate subspace $\langle u, w, a, b \rangle$ and is not a transvection on it, so (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. Now suppose that x is contained in a unitary group $SU(n, 3)$ and that x is not a unitary transvection. Suppose that $n \geq 5$. Then there exists an x invariant orthogonal decomposition $U \perp W$ and as before, it suffices to assume that x acts non-trivially on both subspaces. Moreover, there exists H such that (x, H) is contained in $\mathcal{A}$ unless x acts as a unitary transvection on both U and W. So for all $u \in U$ and all $w \in W$

$$x_U : u \to u + \lambda \kappa_U(u, a)a,\ a \in U, \kappa(a, a) = 0;$$

$$x_W : w \to w + \lambda' \kappa_W(w, b)b,\ b \in W, \kappa(b, b) = 0.$$

Choose u and w, as in the symplectic case, so that $\langle u, w, a, b \rangle$ is a 4 dimensional, non-degenerate subspace on which x acts invariantly, but not as a transvection. Then (x, G) is not a minimal counterexample in this case either. Finally, suppose that x is contained in an orthogonal group $\Omega^\epsilon(n, 3)$ and x is not a long root element. Suppose that $n \geq 9$. Then there exists an x-invariant orthogonal decomposition $U \perp W$. It suffices to assume that the action on U and W is not trivial as in the previous cases. Since $n \geq 9$, it suffices to assume that the dimension of U, k say, is at least 5. Then if (x, G) is a minimal counterexample, x must act as a long root element on U. Now either x acts as a long root element on W, or x does not act as a long root element on W and $n - k \leq 4$. In the latter case one can add dimensions from U to W so that W has dimension at least 5 and W is still x invariant and non-degenerate. If this is done then x_W is contained in an orthogonal group

H such that $(x_W, H) \in \mathcal{A}$. In the former case, $n-k \geq 4$ (W has Witt defect 0 if $n-k=4$) and for all $u \in U$ and all $w \in W$

$$x_U : u \to u + \lambda\kappa_U(u,a)b - \lambda\kappa_U(u,b)a;$$

$$x_W : w \to w + \lambda'\kappa_W(w,c)d - \lambda'\kappa_W(w,d)c$$

where $a, b \in U$; $c, d \in W$; and $Q(a) = Q(b) = \kappa_U(a,b) = 0 = Q(c) = Q(d) = \kappa(c,d)$.

If $u_1, u_2 \in U$ are such that $Q(u_i) = 0 = \kappa_U(u_1, a) = \kappa_U(u_2, b)$, and $\kappa_U(u_1, b) \neq 0$, $\kappa_U(u_2, a) \neq 0$, then x acts invariantly on the non-degenerate 4 dimensional subspace $\langle u_1, u_2, a, b\rangle$. Similarly, take $w_1, w_2 \in W$ such that x acts invariantly on the non-degenerate 4 dimensional subspace $\langle w_1, w_2, c, d\rangle$. Then x acts invariantly on the non-degenerate 8 dimensional subspace $\langle u_1, u_2, a, b, w_1, w_2, c, d\rangle$—which has Witt defect 0—and x does not act as a long root element on it. So it is enough to check the classical groups of dimension at most 8 over $\mathbb{F}_3$ in MAGMA.

If x is a transvection in $SL(n,3)$ then one can reduce to the case where $n=3$. Similarly if x is a transvection in $SU(n,3)$ or $Sp(n,3)$ then one can reduce to the case where $x \in SU(3,3)$ or $x \in Sp(4,3)$. If x is a long root element in an orthogonal group then one can reduce to the six dimensional case but $P\Omega^+(6,3) \cong PSL(4,3)$ and x maps to a transvection under this isomorphism. We can therefore further reduce to $SL(3,3)$. By [GS03], there exist three conjugates of x that generate G_0 when $G_0 = PSL(3,3)$ or $PSU(3,3)$, and four conjugates of x that generate $G_0 = PSp(4,3)$. □

9. Case U

It suffices to assume that $n \geq 3$ and $(n,q) \neq (3,2)$. By Lemmas 7, 11 and 12, if (x,G) is a minimal counterexample, with $G_0 \cong PSU(n,q)$, then x is a semisimple element in $PGU(n,q)$, or x is unipotent in $PSU(3,q)$, and $q \geq 5$.

9.1. $x \in PGU(n,q)$**,** $p \nmid q$ **and** $p \nmid (n, q+1)$**.** By Lemma 3, $x \in PGU(n,q)$ lifts to an element in $GU(n,q)$ of order p, with the same sized conjugacy class. Without loss of generality, it suffices to assume that $G = PGU(n,q)$ by Lemma 4. Consider the minimal polynomial of x, $m_x(t)$ say. Observe that $m_x(t)$ divides t^p-1 and $t^p - 1/(t-1)$ factors over $\mathbb{F}_{q^2}$ as

$$q_1(t) \dots q_s(t)$$

where the $q_i(x)$'s are polynomials of degree k (where k is the smallest positive integer such that $p \mid q^{2k}-1$). The same argument as for the case when $G_0 = PSL(n,q)$ shows that x will leave invariant and act non-trivially and irreducibly on a k dimensional subspace U of V. Since x acts irreducibly on U, U is either non-degenerate or totally singular (for if U is not non degenerate then there exists $v \in U$ such that $\kappa_U(v,u) = 0$ for all $u \in U$; but x acts irreducibly on U so $\kappa_U = 0$). If $k \geq 2$, in both cases, consider the induced isometry x_U of U. If U is totally singular then x_U is contained in a group of type $GL(k, q^2)$ and so (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. If U is non-degenerate then x_U is contained in a subgroup of type $GU(k,q)$. Observe that if U is non-degenerate then k is odd. For if k was even then, since $|GU(k,q)| = q^{k(k-1)/2}\prod_{i=1}^{k}(q^i - (-1)^i)$, and p would divide $q^k - 1 = q^{2j}-1$, contradicting the choice of k. Thus if $k \geq 2$ then unless x acts irreducibly or $q = 2$, $(x_U, GU(k,q))$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}$ and (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

If $q=2$ then there are exceptions in Table 1. If $k > 3$ then x_U is contained in $GU(k,2)$, and the assumption on k implies that $p \neq 3$, so $(x_U, GU(k,2))$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}$. If $(k,q) = (3,2)$ then $p = 7$. Since U is non-degenerate, x also acts invariantly on $U^\perp$. For $n \geq 7$, if this action is non-scalar then $x_{U^\perp}$ is contained in $GU(n-3,2)$ and $(x_{U^\perp}, GU(n-3,2))$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}$. If the action is scalar then take a non-singular vector $w \in U^\perp$, so that x acts invariantly on $U' := U \oplus \langle w\rangle$. Therefore $x_{U'}$ is contained in $GU(4,2)$ and, since $p \neq 3$, it follows that (x,G) is not a minimal counterexample.

If $k = 1$ then x acts invariantly on a 1-dimensional non-degenerate or singular subspace U. Observe that $q \neq 3$ since this would imply that $p = 2$. First suppose that $q \neq 2$ so that $q \geq 4$. If U is non-degenerate then consider the action of x on $U^{\perp}$. Either x acts non-trivially on $U^{\perp}$, in which case $x_{U^{\perp}}$ will be contained in $GU(n-1, q)$, or x has a scalar action on $U^{\perp}$, in which case there exists a 2-dimensional non-degenerate subspace U' such that $x_{U'}$ is contained in $GU(2, q)$. Since $q \geq 4$, (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample in any case. Now suppose that $q = 2$ and $k = 1$ so that $p = 3$. If x has order 3 in $GU(n, 2)$ then a Sylow 3-subgroup is contained in a subgroup of type $GU(1, q) \wr S_n$. So it suffices to assume that x will lie in a subgroup $GU(1, 2) \wr S_n$, and if $n \geq 5$, it suffices to assume that x is contained in $GU(1, 2) \perp \ldots \perp GU(1, 2)$ since otherwise x will be non-trivial in a subgroup of type S_n. Thus for $n \geq 5$, if x is not a reflection then there exists an $n-1$ dimensional, non-degenerate, x-invariant subspace U' such that $x_{U'} \in GU(n-1, 2)$ with $(x_{U'}, GU(n-1, 2))$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}$. A MAGMA calculation shows that the only exceptions to the theorem for $G := PGU(4, 2)$ are reflections of order 3. If x is a reflection of order 3 in $GU(n, 2)$ then it suffices to treat the case where x is contained in $GU(4, 2)$. A calculation in MAGMA shows that there exist $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2}, x^{g_3} \rangle$ is not solvable.

If $k = 1$ and there is not a 1-dimensional non-degenerate x invariant subspace then U is totally singular and x is contained in a parabolic subgroup. Thus by Lemma 6, it suffices to assume that x acts non-centrally on each component of the Levi complement of some maximal parabolic subgroup. The parabolic subgroups of ${}^2A_m(q)$ have Levi complements of type ${}^2A_{m-2}(q)$, $A_k(q^2){}^2A_{m-2k-2}(q)$ and, if m is odd, ${}^2A_{(m-1)/2}(q^2)$. So (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample unless $m = 2$, $(m, q) = (3, 2)$, or $(m, q) = (4, 2)$. If $m = 2$, then x is a reducible semisimple element in $GU(3, q)$, so $q \geq 4$ and so x leaves invariant a 2 dimensional, non-degenerate subspace U'. In this case, $x_{U'}$ is contained in $GU(2, q)$ and so $(x_{U'}, GU(2, q))$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}$. When $(m, q) = (3, 2)$, $G_0 = PSU(4, 2)$. When $(m, q) = (4, 2)$, $G_0 \cong PSU(5, 2)$. These cases can be excluded using MAGMA.

The remaining case is when $k = n$ and x acts irreducibly in $GU(n, q)$ where $n \geq 3$ is odd (and $(n, q) \neq (3, 2)$). Now one can use [GPPS99] to find the possibilities for a maximal subgroup M containing $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ in $GU(n, q)$. Note that x is a ppd(n,q^2,n)-element, and that $n \geq 3$ is odd. So since n is not a power of 2 there are no 2.5 examples. Lemma 9 implies that M must be a type 2.1 or 2.4(b) subgroup. By [KL90], the only possible such classical maximal subgroups are of type $GU(n, q_0)$ and $O_n(q)$ (q odd). The only subgroups of this type which contain an element of order $p \geq 5$ and are not almost simple modulo scalars are those of type $O_3(3)$ when $n = q = 3$. One can treat $GU(3, 3)$ separately in MAGMA. The only other examples are the field extension examples (type 2.4(b)). By [KL90] and since n is odd these are subgroups of type $GU(n/r, q^r)$ where r is an odd prime. Now unless $n = r$ these subgroups are almost simple modulo scalars and thus (x, M) is contained in $\mathcal{A}$. If $n = r$ and $x \in M$, where M is a subgroup of type $GU(1, q^n)$, then observe that x is contained in only one such maximal subgroup and Theorem 4 implies that (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

9.2. $x \in PGU(n, q)$ **and** $p \mid (q + 1, n)$**.** Observe that Lemma 4 still applies so assume that $G = PGU(n, q)$. This time some conjugacy classes of order p could only lift to non-trivial scalars in $GU(n, q)$. If x lifts to an element of order p in $GU(n, q)$ then apply the same argument as in the previous section. If not then x^p lifts to a non-trivial scalar in $GU(n, q)$. So x will have order $p^m j$ say where $p \nmid j$, but since $\langle x^j \rangle \leq \langle x \rangle$ and x^j will still have order p in $PGU(n, q)$, it suffices to assume that $j = 1$. So assume that the order of x in $GU(n, q)$ is p^m. The minimal polynomial of x, $m_x(t)$ divides $t^p - \zeta_{p^{m-1}}$ where $\zeta_{p^{m-1}}$ is a primitive p^{m-1}th root of unity in $\mathbb{F}_{q^2}$, and $p^{m-1} \mid (q+1)$. Since there are pth roots of unity, either $t^p - \zeta_{p^{m-1}}$ splits, or it is irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_{q^2}$. For if a is a root of the equation $t^p - \zeta_{p^{m-1}} = 0$ contained in some field extension, then this field extension contains all of the roots, $a\omega, a\omega^2, \ldots, a\omega^{p-1}$. So $t^p - \zeta_{p^{m-1}}$ will factor into irreducible polynomials of degree equal to the degree of the smallest field extension containing a. However, p is prime, so the degree of these polynomials is either 1 or p. If $t^p - \zeta_{p^{m-1}}$ splits then $m_x(t)|(t-\zeta_{p^m})(t-\zeta_{p^m}\omega)\dots(t-\zeta_{p^m}\omega^{p-1})$, where ζ_{p^m} is a primitive p^mth root of unity in $\mathbb{F}_{q^2}$. However this would imply that p^m divides $q+1$. For $p^{m-1} \mid (q+1)$, and since $\zeta_{p^m} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^2}$, $p^m \mid (q-1)(q+1)$, but $p \nmid q-1$ since $p \geq 3$. This would be a contradiction, since $z = \zeta_{p^m} I_n$ would lie in $Z(GU(n,q))$, so $(z^{-1}x)^p = \zeta_{p^{m-1}}^{-1}\zeta_{p^{m-1}} I_n = I_n$, and x would lift to an element of order p. So, it suffices to assume that $m_x(t) = t^p - \zeta_{p^{m-1}}$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_{q^2}$. It follows that x has rational canonical form $\mathrm{diag}[\mathrm{A}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{n/p}}]$, where

$$A_i = \begin{pmatrix} & I_{p-1} \\ \zeta_{p^{m-1}} & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus x acts irreducibly on a subspace W of dimension p. Now $p^m \mid q^{2p}-1$, and in fact $p^m \mid q^p+1$, since if $p \mid q^p - 1$ then $q^p \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ but also $q^p \equiv q \pmod{p}$ by Fermat's Little Theorem. Therefore $q \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, and $p \mid q+1$ which contradicts the assumption that $p \geq 3$. So p^m divides q^p+1.

Assume that W is non-degenerate since if W was totally singular then x_W would be contained in $GL(p,q^2)$ and $(x_W, GL(p,q^2))$ would be contained in $\mathcal{A}$. Thus, if x does not lift to an element of order p then it suffices to assume that $n = p$ and that x acts irreducibly.

Since $n = p$, and $p \mid q+1$, one can show that a maximal subgroup M of $GU(p,q)$ of type $GU(1,q) \wr S_p$ always contains a Sylow p-subgroup of $GU(p,q)$. Thus, it suffices to assume that x is contained in M, the normalizer of a maximal split torus T. Moreover, x is non-trivial in $N_G(T)/T \cong S_p$, since it acts irreducibly. So if $p \geq 5$ then x cannot be a minimal counterexample. Now suppose that $p = 3$. Then x is an irreducible element in $GU(3,q)$. The character table of $GU(3,q)$ in [Enn62] and the same argument as when $G_0 = PSL(2,q)$ implies that there exists an element z in $GU(3,q)$ of order q^2-1 such that x is conjugate to xz. So, if $x^g = xz$ then $\langle x, x^g\rangle = \langle x, z\rangle$ contains $PSU(3,q)$, since it cannot be contained in any of the maximal subgroups described in [GLS98, Theorem 6.5.3].

9.3. $x \in PSU(3,q)$ **and** $p \mid q$**,** $q \geq 5$**.** If x is a unipotent element in $G_0 = PSU(3,q)$ then the maximal subgroups of G_0 are described in [GLS98, Theorem 6.5.3] and Lemma 5 can be applied. By Lemma 12, there are no minimal counterexamples when $q = 3$. So assume that $q \geq 5$. If x is a transvection then it stabilizes a non-degenerate 2 dimensional subspace, and acts non-trivially on it, so (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. Thus x is not a transvection and $|C_{PSU(3,q)}(x)| = q^2$. Since (x,G) is a minimal counterexample, the only possibilities for maximal subgroups X_i containing x are of type $GU(1,q) \wr S_3$ (for $p = 3$), $GU(1,q^3)$ (for $p = 3$), and parabolic subgroups. Note that $PSU(3,2)$ and $PGU(3,2)$ do not contain x since they are $\{2,3\}$-groups that are only relevant when $3 \nmid q$. There is only one conjugacy class of each of the given subgroups and $|x^{PSU(3,q)} \cap X_i|$ is at most $6(q+1)^2$, $3(q^2-q+1)$, and q^3-1 in each case respectively. So

$$|G|/|C_G(x)|^2 = q^3(q^2-1)(q^3+1)/q^4 = (q^2-1)(q^3+1)/q \geq$$
$$(q^3-1)+(q^2-q+1).3+(q+1)^2.6 \geq \sum_i |x^G \cap X_i|$$

for $q \geq 5$, and thus (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample by Lemma 5. □

10. Case S

If $G_0 \cong PSp(n,q)$ then the only case left to prove is when x is a semisimple element contained in $\mathrm{Inndiag}(PSp(n,q)) \cong PGSp(n,q)$. Since $|PGSp(n,q) : PSp(n,q)| = (2,q-1)$, x must be contained in $PSp(n,q)$, so suppose that $G = G_0$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3, x always lifts to an element in $Sp(n,q)$ of order p.

Let e be the smallest positive integer such that $p \mid q^e - 1$. Hence the minimal polynomial of x will be a product of irreducibles of degree e, and possibly $t - 1$. Also, V will have an e-dimensional x invariant subspace U, on which x acts irreducibly. U is either totally singular or non-degenerate. This depends on e:

- *e odd and $e \neq 1$* If e is odd then U is totally singular since there are no non-degenerate subspaces of V of odd order. So, if $e \geq 3$ then it suffices to assume that x acts non-trivially on U, and x_U is contained in a subgroup H of type $GL(e, q)$. Clearly (x, H) is contained in $\mathcal{A}$ in this case.
- $e = 1$. If e is 1 then U is a 1 dimensional totally singular subspace, so x is contained in a parabolic subgroup. By Lemma 6, it suffices to assume that x acts non-centrally on all the components of the Levi complement of a maximal parabolic subgroup. This maximal parabolic subgroup can be of type $C_{m-1}(q)$ $(m \geq 3)$; $A_k(q)C_{m-k-1}(q)$ $(m \geq 4, 1 \leq k \leq m-3$); $A_{m-1}(q)$; or $A_1(q)A_1(q)$ $(m = 3)$. Since $p \mid q - 1$, q is at least 4, thus (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.
- *e even, $e < n$* If U is totally singular then x_U is contained in a subgroup H of type $GL(e, q)$, and (x, H) is in $\mathcal{A}$ unless $(e, q) = (2, 2)$ (if $(e, q) = (2, 3)$ then $p = 2$). If $(e, q) = (2, 2)$ then it suffices to assume that $n \geq 8$, since $Sp(4, 2) \cong S_6$, and the case $Sp(6, 2)$ can be excluded using MAGMA. Since U is totally singular, x is contained in a parabolic subgroup so we can use Lemma 6 as in the previous case. It follows that (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample in this case either. If U is non-degenerate then x_U is contained in a subgroup H of type $Sp(e, q)$. (x, H) is contained in $\mathcal{A}$ for $e \geq 4$ and for $e = 2$, $q \geq 4$. If $e = 2$, and $q \leq 3$ then $q = 2$. But it suffices to assume that $n \geq 6$, since $Sp(4, 2) \cong S_6$, so $x_{U^\perp}$ is contained in a subgroup H of type $Sp(n - e, 2)$ and (x, H) is contained in $\mathcal{A}$.

If x acts irreducibly then [GPPS99] describes the possible maximal subgroups of $Sp(n, q)$ that could contain x. It suffices to assume that n is at least 4, since $SL(2, q) \cong Sp(2, q)$. The only M's of concern are those that contain ppd(n,q,n)-elements. By Lemma 9, it suffices to assume that M is a subgroup of type 2.1, 2.4(b) or 2.5. If M were a subgroup of type 2.1 then so long as M is almost simple modulo scalars, (x, M) is contained in $\mathcal{A}$. By [KL90], the only possible such maximal subgroups M are type 2.1(b) where M contains $Sp(n, q_0)$; and type 2.1(d) where M contains $\Omega^\epsilon(n, q_0)$ for q_0 even. In these cases, M is almost simple and (x, M) is contained in $\mathcal{A}$ unless $(n, q) = (4, 2)$. However since $Sp(4, 2) \cong S_6$, this case can be excluded. If M is of type 2.5 then by [KL90], M would be of type $P.O^-(2m, 2)$ where q is an odd prime, $n = 2^m$, and P is a 2-subgroup. However since x has odd order, $xO_2(M)$ would be non-trivial in the quotient $M/O_2(M)$. Moreover, $e \geq 4$ implies that $m \geq 2$ and thus $M/O_2(M)$ is almost simple of type $O^-(2m, 2)$. The only other possibility for M is to be of type 2.4(b). In this case, by [KL90], M would be of type $Sp(n/b, q^b)$, where b is a prime and n/b is even; or of type $GU(n/2, q)$. However, since $n \geq 4$, these are all almost simple modulo scalars unless $(n, q) = (4, 2)$, $(4, 3)$, or $(6, 2)$. These exceptions are not a problem since $Sp(4, 2) \cong S_6$, $PSp(4, 3) \cong PSU(4, 2)$ ($p \neq 3$ since x is a ppd(4,3,4)-element) and there are no elements of prime order in $Sp(6, 2)$ that act irreducibly.

11. Case O

It suffices to assume that $n \geq 7$ since otherwise G_0 is isomorphic to one of the classical groups that have already been considered. If $x \in \mathrm{Inndiag}(P\Omega^\epsilon_n(q))$ has odd prime order then $x \in P\Omega^\epsilon_n(q)$. By Lemma 3, x lifts to an element of order p in $\Omega^\epsilon_n(q)$. Lemmas 7, 11, and 12 imply that if (x, G) is a minimal counterexample then $x \in \mathrm{Inndiag}(G_0)$ and x is semisimple.

Let e be minimal such that $p \mid q^e - 1$, so there exists an e-dimensional subspace U on which x acts invariantly and irreducibly. Consider the different values for e:

- *e odd, $e \geq 3$.* If e is odd then $p \nmid |O(e,q)|$ so U must be totally singular. It follows that x_U is contained in a subgroup H of type $GL(e,q)$ and $(x_U,H) \in \mathcal{A}$.
- $e = 1$. If $e = 1$ then $q \geq 4$ since $p \mid q-1$. If x acts invariantly on a non-degenerate 1-dimensional subspace U then consider the action of x on $U^\perp$. If this action is non-scalar then (x,G) is not a minimal counterexample since $x_{U^\perp}$ is contained in a subgroup H of type $O^\epsilon(n-1,q)$ and $(x_{U^\perp},H)$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}$ since $n \geq 7$. If the action is scalar, then there exists a 3-dimensional subspace Y of $U^\perp$ such that $U' := U \oplus Y$ is non-degenerate and x invariant. In this case, $x_{U'}$ will be contained in a subgroup H of type $O^\epsilon(4,q)$. In particular, $(x_{U'},H)$ would be contained in $\mathcal{A}$. If x acts invariantly on a singular, 1-dimensional subspace then x is contained in a parabolic subgroup. Thus, by Lemma 6, it suffices to assume that x acts non-centrally on each component of the Levi complement of some maximal parabolic subgroup. The possible types of maximal parabolic subgroup are: $A_{m-1}(q)$, or $B_{m-1}(q)$ if $G_0 = B_m(q)$; $D_{m-1}(q)$, $A_{m-1}(q)$, $A_{m-3}(q)A_1(q)A_1(q)$, or $A_k(q)D_{m-k-1}(q)$ if $G_0 = D_m(q)$; or ${}^2D_{m-1}(q)$, $A_{m-2}(q)$, $A_k(q)^2D_{m-k-1}(q)$, or $A_{m-3}(q)A_1(q^2)$ if $G_0 = {}^2D_m(q)$. Since if $G_0 = B_m(q)$ then $m \geq 3$ and in the other cases $m \geq 4$, it follows that (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.
- $e = 2$. If $e = 2$ then $p \mid q+1$. If U is totally singular then x is contained in parabolic subgroup and Lemma 6 is applied as above. If $G_0 = B_m(q)$, then $m \geq 3$ and $q \geq 5$ since $B_m(2^a) \cong C_m(2^a)$. The only complication is that if $G_0 = D_4(2)$ then all of the components of a parabolic subgroup of type $A_1(q)A_1(q)A_(q)$ are solvable. One can verify in MAGMA that there are no counterexamples when $G_0 = D_4(2)$. Now suppose that x acts invariantly on a 2-dimensional non-degenerate subspace U. Then U will be anisotropic because of the order of x. If the action of x on $U^\perp$ is non-scalar then $x_{U^\perp}$ will be contained in a subgroup H of type $O^{-\epsilon}(n-2,q)$ (since U has Witt defect 1, [KL90, 4.1.6]) and $(x_{U^\perp},H)$ will be contained in $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose that x acts as a scalar on $U^\perp$. In this case, let W be a 4-dimensional non-degenerate subspace of $U^\perp$ (of Witt defect 0). Then x will act invariantly on the non-degenerate space $U' = U \oplus W$. So $x_{U'}$ will be contained in a subgroup H of type $O^-(6,q)$, and $(x_{U'},H)$ will be contained in $\mathcal{A}$.
- *e even, $e \geq 4$.* If e is even then $p \mid q^{e/2}+1$. Suppose that U is totally singular. Then x_U will be contained in a subgroup H of type $GL(e,q)$, and (x_U,H) will be contained in $\mathcal{A}$ since $e \geq 4$. So assume that U is non-degenerate. If $e \neq n$ then x_U will lie in a subgroup H of type $O^-(e,q)$, with (x_U,H) contained in $\mathcal{A}$. The only case left to consider is where x acts irreducibly on $O^-(e,q)$.

Since $e = n$ is even it suffices to assume that $n \geq 8$. One can use [KL90] and [GPPS99] to find the possible maximal overgroups of x. Lemma 9 implies that M must be a subgroup of type 2.1, 2.4(b) or 2.5. The only subgroups M of type 2.1 are of type $O^-(n,q_0)$, and if M was such a subgroup then (x,M) would be contained in $\mathcal{A}$. There are no symplectic type normalizer maximal subgroups in $O^-(n,q)$, so there are no 2.5 type maximal subgroups. This leaves field extension examples of type 2.4. The possibilities are subgroups of type $GU(n/2,q)$, $O^-(n/2,q^2)$, and $O^-(n/r,q^r)$ for r a prime and $e/r \geq 4$. All of these are almost simple modulo scalars and (x,M) would be contained in $\mathcal{A}$. Thus, (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

12. $E_l(q)$

Now suppose that G_0 is an exceptional group of type $E_l(q)$, for $l =$ 6,7, or 8. If (x,G) is a minimal counterexample then by Lemmas 7 and 11 either $x \in G_0$ and $p = q = 3$, or $x \in \mathrm{Inndiag}(G_0)$ and $p \nmid q$.

First suppose that $p = q = 3$. If x is a long root element then $\langle x, x^g\rangle$ is either a 3-group or a fundamental $SL(2,3)$ subgroup, by [GLS98, Proposition 3.2.9]. The unipotent conjugacy classes are described in [Miz77, Miz80]. Tables 4, 5, and 6 list the representatives for the unipotent classes of order 3 in $E_l(3)$, and describe a subsystem subgroup H containing each representative. The tables show that there are no minimal counterexamples when x is unipotent.

Representative in $E_6(3)$	Roots generating subsystem	Subsystem type
$x_{100000}(1)$ [a]	$\{100000, 001000, 000100, 000010, 000001\}$	$A_5(q)$
$x_{100000}(1)x_{001000}(1)$	$\{100000, 001000, 000100, 000010, 000001\}$	$A_5(q)$
$x_{100000}(1)x_{000100}(1)$	$\{100000, 001000, 000100, 000010, 000001\}$	$A_5(q)$
$x_{100000}(1)x_{001000}(1)x_{000010}(1)$	$\{100000, 001000, 000100, 000010, 000001\}$	$A_5(q)$
$x_{100000}(1)x_{000100}(1)x_{000001}(1)$	$\{100000, 001000, 000100, 000010, 000001\}$	$A_5(q)$
$x_{100000}(1)x_{001000}(1)x_{000010}(1)x_{000001}(1)$	$\{100000, 001000, 000100, 000010, 000001\}$	$A_5(q)$
$x_{100000}(1)x_{001000}(1)x_{001000}(1)x_{000010}(1)$	$\{100000, 001000, 000100, 000010, 010000\}$	$D_5(q)$
$x_{100000}(1)x_{001000}(1)x_{000010}(1)x_{000001}(1)x_{010000}(1)$	$\{100000, 010000, 001000, 000010, 000001\}$	$A_2(q)A_2(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{100000}(1)x_{000100}(1)x_{000001}(1)x_{122321}(1)$	$\{100000, 000100, 000010, 000001, 122321\}$	$A_1(q)A_3(q)A_1(q)$

---

[a] In this case, x is a long root element in $A_5(3)$ and so we can find g_1, g_2 such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2} \rangle$ is not solvable

TABLE 4. Conjugacy classes in $E_6(3)$ of elements of order 3

Representative in $E_7(3)$	Roots generating subsystem	Subsystem type
$x_{34}(1)x_{36}(1)x_{37}(1)x_{38}(1)x_{40}(1)$	$\alpha_{34}, \alpha_{40}, \alpha_{36}, \alpha_{38}, \alpha_{37}$	$A_2(q)A_2(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{34}(1)x_{36}(1)x_{38}(1)x_{40}(1)$	$\alpha_{34}, \alpha_{40}, \alpha_{36}, \alpha_{38}$	$A_2(q)A_2(q)$
$x_{37}(1)x_{38}(1)x_{39}(1)x_{40}(1)x_{41}(1)$	$\alpha_{37}, \alpha_{38}, \alpha_{39}, \alpha_{40}, \alpha_{41}$	$A_1(q)^2A_2(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{42}(1)x_{43}(1)x_{44}(1)x_{45}(1)$	$\alpha_{42}, \alpha_{45}, \alpha_{43}, \alpha_{44}$	$A_2(q)A_1(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{44}(1)x_{46}(1)x_{49}(1)$	$\alpha_{44}, \alpha_{46}, \alpha_{49}$	$A_2(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{42}(1)x_{43}(1)x_{44}(1)x_{51}(\zeta)x_{49}(1)$	$\alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_7, \alpha_{38}, \alpha_{49}$	$D_4(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{44}(1)x_{46}(1)$	α_{44}, α_{46}	$A_2(q)$
$x_{42}(1)x_{43}(1)x_{44}(1)x_{51}(\zeta)$	$\alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_7, \alpha_{38}$	$D_4(q)$
$x_{47}(1)x_{48}(1)x_{49}(1)x_{53}(1)$	$\alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_{44}, \alpha_{53}, \alpha_{49}$	$A_3(q)A_1(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{47}(\zeta)x_{48}(1)x_{49}(1)x_{53}(1)$	$\alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_{44}, \alpha_{53}, \alpha_{49}$	$A_3(q)A_1(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{47}(1)x_{48}(1)x_{49}(1)$	$\alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_{44}, \alpha_{49}$	$A_3(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{47}(\zeta)x_{48}(1)x_{49}(1)$	$\alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_{44}, \alpha_{49}$	$A_3(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{53}(1)x_{54}(1)x_{55}(1)$	$\alpha_2, \alpha_7, \alpha_{50}, \alpha_{55}$	$A_3(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{58}(1)x_{59}(1)$	$\alpha_2, \alpha_5, \alpha_{57}$	$A_3(q)$
$x_{63}(1)$ [a]	α_1, α_{62}	$A_2(q)$

TABLE 5. Conjugacy classes in $E_7(3)$ of elements of order 3

---

[a] In this case, x is a long root element in $A_2(3)$ and so we can find g_1, g_2 such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2} \rangle$ is not solvable

Representative in $E_8(3)$	Roots generating subsystem	Subsystem type
$x_{53}(1)x_{54}(1)x_{55}(1)x_{117}(1)x_{118}(1)x_{119}(1)$	$\alpha_{53}, \alpha_{119}, \alpha_{54}, \alpha_{55}, \alpha_{117}, \alpha_{118}$	$A_2(q)^2 A_1(q)^2$
$x_{56}(1)x_{57}(1)x_{117}(1)x_{118}(1)x_{119}(1)$	$\alpha_{56}, \alpha_{57}, \alpha_{117}, \alpha_{118}, \alpha_{119}$	$A_2(q)A_2(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{56}(1)x_{57}(1)x_{117}(1)x_{118}(1)$	$\alpha_{56}, \alpha_{57}, \alpha_{117}, \alpha_{118}$	$A_2(q)A_2(q)$
$x_{53}(1)x_{54}(1)x_{55}(1)x_{117}(1)x_{124}(\zeta)x_{122}(1)$	$\alpha_{53}, \alpha_{122}, \alpha_{54}, \alpha_{55}, \alpha_{117}, \alpha_{124}$	$A_2(q)A_1(q)^4$
$x_{58}(1)x_{59}(1)x_{123}(1)x_{124}(1)x_{125}(1)$	$\alpha_{58}, \alpha_{59}, \alpha_{123}, \alpha_{124}, \alpha_{125}$	$A_1(q)A_2(q)A_1(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{60}(1)x_{126}(1)x_{127}(1)x_{128}(1)$	$\alpha_{60}, \alpha_{126}, \alpha_{127}, \alpha_{128}$	$A_2(q)A_1(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{63}(1)x_{127}(1)x_{130}(1)$	$\alpha_{63}, \alpha_{127}, \alpha_{130}$	$A_1(q)A_2(q)$
$x_{63}(1)x_{126}(1)x_{127}(1)x_{128}(1)x_{133}(\zeta)$	$\alpha_2, \alpha_5, \alpha_7, \alpha_{124}, \alpha_{63}$	$D_4(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{63}(1)x_{135}(1)x_{136}(1)x_{137}(1)$	$\alpha_1, \alpha_{101}, \alpha_{62}, \alpha_{136}, \alpha_{137}$	$A_3(q)A_1(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{127}(1)x_{130}(1)$	$\alpha_{124}, \alpha_2, \alpha_5, \alpha_7$	$D_4(q)$
$x_{126}(1)x_{127}(1)x_{128}(1)x_{133}(\zeta)$	$\alpha_2, \alpha_5, \alpha_7, \alpha_{124}$	$D_4(q)$
$x_{141}(1)x_{142}(1)x_{143}(1)$	$\alpha_1, \alpha_6, \alpha_{135}, \alpha_{143}$	$A_3(q)A_1(q)$
$x_{150}(1)x_{151}(1)$	$\alpha_3, \alpha_2, \alpha_{148}$	$A_3(q)$
$x_{157}(1)$ [a]	α_8, α_{156}	$A_2(q)$

---

[a] In this case, x is a long root element in $A_2(3)$ and so there exist g_1, g_2 such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2} \rangle$ is not solvable

TABLE 6. Conjugacy classes in $E_8(3)$ of elements of order 3

X_i	Bound on $\lvert x^G \cap X_i\rvert$	Cruder bound
$d.(L(2,q) \times L(6,q)).de$	0	0
$e.L(3,q)^3.e^2.S_3$	0	q^9
$f.(L(3,q^2) \times U(3,q)).g.2$	0	0
$L(3,q^3).(e \times 3)$	0	0
$d^2.(P\Omega^+(8,q) \times (q-1/d)^2).d^2.S_3$	q^2	
$({}^3D_4(q) \times (q^2+q+1)).3$	q^2+q+1	q^3
$h.(P\Omega^+(10,q) \times (q-1/h)).h$	$h(q-1)$	q^3
$(q-1)^6.W(E_6)$, $q \geq 5$	$(q-1)^6.51840$	q^{13}
$(q^2+q+1)^3.3^{1+2}SL(2,3)$	$(q^2+q+1)^3$	q^9
$3^{3+3}.SL(3,3)$	0	

TABLE 7. Bounds on $|x^G \cap X_i|$ for subgroups X_i of $E_6(q)$, $p \geq 5$. $d = (2, q-1)$, $e = (3, q-1)$, $f = (3, q+1)$, $g = (3, q^2-1)$, $h = (4, q-1)$

The only other possibility is that $p \nmid q$ and $x \in \mathrm{Inndiag}(G_0)$. By Lemma 4, it suffices to assume that $G = \mathrm{Inndiag}(G_0)$. If x is semisimple then consider the case where x is contained in a parabolic subgroup. By Lemma 6, there is a conjugate of x that is contained in a maximal parabolic that does not centralize any component of the Levi complement. For $l = 6$, P will be of type $D_5(q)$, $A_1(q)A_4(q)$, or $A_5(q)$, and so (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. Similarly, for $l = 7$ and 8 one can reduce to a case where x is acting non-centrally on a component of a Levi complement. So it suffices to assume that x is not contained in any parabolic subgroups. In this case, x is semisimple, and $C_G(x)$ is a reductive group containing no unipotent elements. Thus, $C_G(x)$ is a torus, and by [Sei83] for example, it follows that $|C_G(x)| \leq (q+1)^l$. The conjugacy classes of semisimple elements of order 3 are described in [GLS98, Table 4.7.3A]. So if x is not contained in a parabolic subgroup then it suffices to assume that $p \geq 5$, since $|C_G(x)| > (q+1)^l$ for any $x \in E_l(q)$ of order 3. This observation is useful since it implies that $x \in O_\infty(M)$ for all maximal subgroups M containing x, otherwise (x, G) could not be a minimal counterexample. If $l = 6$ then

$$|G|/|C_G(x)|^2 \geq \frac{q^{36}(q^{12}-1)(q^9-1)(q^8-1)(q^6-1)(q^5-1)(q^2-1)}{3(q+1)^{12}},$$

which is at least q^{55}, for $q \geq 2$. The maximal subgroups of $E_6(q)$ are described in [LS03] and [LSS92]. The possible maximal subgroups X_i containing x are listed in Table 7 together with a crude bound on $|x^G \cap X_i|$. Clearly the hypotheses of Lemma 5 are satisfied and there is no minimal counterexample when $l = 6$.

Now suppose that $l = 7$. Then

$$\frac{|G|}{|C_G(x)|^2} \geq \frac{q^{63}(q^{18}-1)(q^{14}-1)(q^{12}-1)(q^{10}-1)(q^8-1)(q^6-1)(q^2-1)}{2(q+1)^{14}},$$

which is at least q^{111} for $q \geq 2$. Table 8 implies that the hypotheses of Lemma 5 are satisfied, and there is no minimal counterexample when $l = 7$. If $l = 8$ then

$$\frac{|G|}{|C_G(x)|^2} \geq \frac{q^{120}(q^{30}-1)(q^{24}-1)(q^{20}-1)(q^{18}-1)(q^{14}-1)(q^{12}-1)(q^8-1)(q^2-1)}{2(q+1)^{16}},$$

which is at least q^{239} for $q \geq 2$. Table 9 shows that the hypotheses of Lemma 5 are satisfied, and (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

$X_i \leq E_7(q)$	Bound on $\lvert x^G \cap X_i \rvert$
$d.(L(2,q) \times P\Omega^+(12,q)).d$	0
$f.L^\epsilon(8,q).g.(2 \times (2/f),\ \epsilon = +1$	0
$f.L^\epsilon(8,q).g.(2 \times (2/f),\ \epsilon = -1$	0
$e.L^\epsilon(3,q) \times L^\epsilon(6,q).de.2,\ \epsilon = +1$	0
$e.L^\epsilon(3,q) \times L^\epsilon(6,q).de.2,\ \epsilon = -1$	0
$d^2.(L(2,q)^3 \times P\Omega^+(8,q)).d^3.S_3$	0
$(L(2,q^3) \times {}^3D_4(q)).3d$	0
$d^3.(L(2,q)^7.d^4.L(3,2))$	0
$L(2,q^7).7d$	0
$e.(E_6(q) \times (q-1)/e).e.2, \epsilon = 1$	q
$e.({}^2E_6(q) \times (q+1)/e).e.2, \epsilon = -1$	q^2
$(q-1)^7.W(E_7)$	q^{30}
$(q+1)^7.W(E_7)$	q^{37}
$(2^2 \times P\Omega^+(8,q).2^2).S_3$	0
${}^3D_4(q).3$	0

Table 8. Bounds on $|x^G \cap X_i|$ for subgroups X_i of $E_7(q)$, $p \geq 5$. $d = (2, q-1)$, $e = (3, q-\epsilon)$, $f = (4, q-\epsilon)/d$, $g = (8, q-\epsilon)/d$

13. ${}^2E_6(q)$

If x is unipotent then Lemma 11 implies that $p = 3$. For $q = 3$, the unipotent class representatives were obtained from Frank Lübeck, using CHEVIE ([GHL$^+$96]). From the class representatives, one can deduce that (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. If x is semisimple and contained in a maximal parabolic subgroup then, by Lemma 6, it suffices to assume that x acts non centrally on all of the components of the Levi complement. If this parabolic is an end node parabolic then the Levi complement is of type ${}^2D_4(q)$ or ${}^2A_5(q)$. If P is not an end-node parabolic then it can be either of type $A_1(q^2)A_2(q)$ or $A_1(q)A_2(q^2)$. Thus, (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample if x is contained in a parabolic subgroup.

So suppose that x is semisimple, and does not lie in any parabolic subgroups. Then $C_G(x)$ is a torus, and as in the previous section, note that if x has order 3 then $|C_G(x)| > (q+1)^6$ (by [GLS98, Table 4.7.3A]). Thus, by [Sei83], it suffices to assume that $p \geq 5$. Moreover,

$$|G|/|C_G(x)|^2 \geq \frac{q^{36}(q^{12}-1)(q^9+1)(q^8-1)(q^6-1)(q^5+1)(q^2-1)}{3(q+1)^{12}},$$

which is at least q^{55} for $q \geq 2$. The possible maximal subgroups containing x are given in Table 10. Again, the hypothesis of Lemma 5 holds and (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

14. $F_4(q)$

Observe that $\mathrm{Inndiag}(\mathrm{G}_0) = \mathrm{G}_0$. If x is unipotent then $q = 3$, and [Law95] and [Sho74] contain representatives for the classes of elements of order 3. They are listed in Table 11 together with subsystem overgroups of x that show that (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

If x is semisimple and contained in a parabolic subgroup then Lemma 6 implies that x acts non-trivially on all of the components of the Levi complement of some parabolic P. If P is an end node parabolic subgroup the Levi complement is of type $B_3(q)$ or $C_3(q)$. If P is not an end node parabolic subgroup then P is of type $A_1(q)A_2(q)$. It suffices to assume that x does not centralize the $A_1(q)$ or $A_2(q)$ components so (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. Now suppose that x

$X_i \leq E_8(q)$	Bound on $\lvert x^G \cap X_i\rvert$
$d.P\Omega^+(16,q).d$	0
$d.(L(2,q) \times E_7(q)).d$	0
$f.(L^\epsilon(9,q)).e.2$, $\epsilon = +1$	0
$f.(L^\epsilon(9,q)).e.2$, $\epsilon = -1$	0
$e.(L^\epsilon(3,q) \times E_6^\epsilon(q)).e.2$, $\epsilon = +1$	0
$e.(L^\epsilon(3,q) \times E_6^\epsilon(q)).e.2$, $\epsilon = -1$	0
$g.(L^\epsilon(5,q))^2.g.4, \epsilon = +1$	5
$g.(L^\epsilon(5,q))^2.g.4, \epsilon = -1$	5
$SU(5,q^2).4$	0
$PGU(5,q^2).4$	0
$d^2.(P\Omega^+(8,q))^2.d^2.(S_3 \times 2)$	0
$d^2.(P\Omega^+(8,q^2)).(S_3 \times 2)$	0
$({}^3D_4(q))^2.6$	0
$({}^3D_4(q^2)).6$	0
$e^2.L^\epsilon(3,q)^4.e^2.GL(2,3)$, $\epsilon = +1$	0
$e^2.L^\epsilon(3,q)^4.e^2.GL(2,3)$, $\epsilon = -1$	0
$U(3,q^2)^2.8$	0
$U(3,q^4).8$	0
$d^4.L(2,q)^8.d^4.AGL(3,2)$, $q > 2$	0
$(q-1)^8.W(E_8)$	q^{46}
$(q+1)^8.W(E_8)$	q^{46}
$(q^4+q^3+q^2+q+1)^2.(5 \times SL(2,5))$	$5q^{10}$
$(q^2+q+1)^4.2.(3 \times U(4,2))$	q^{15}
$(q^2+1)^4.(4 \circ 2^{1+4}).A_6.2$	q^{12}
$q^8+q^7-q^5-q^4-q^3+q+1.\mathbb{Z}_{30}$	q^{15}
$(q^4-q^2+1)^2.(\mathbb{Z}_{12} \circ GL(2,3))$	q^{10}
$(q^8-q^7+q^5-q^4+q^3-q+1).\mathbb{Z}_{30}$	q^{15}
$(q^4-q^3+q^2-q+1)^2.(5 \times SL(2,5))$	$5q^{10}$
$(q^2-q+1)^4.2.(3 \times U(4,2))$	q^{12}
$2^{5+10}.SL(5,2)$ (exotic)	0
$5^3.SL(3,5)$ (exotic)	q^7

TABLE 9. Bounds on $|x^G \cap X_i|$ for X_i a subgroup of $E_8(q)$, $p \geq 5$. $d = (2, q-1)$, $e = (3, q-\epsilon)$, $f = (9, q-\epsilon)/e$, $g = (5, q-\epsilon)$

does not lie in any parabolic subgroups. Then $|C_G(x)| \leq (q+1)^4$ by [Sei83]. However, by [GLS98, Table 4.7.3A], this condition implies that $p \neq 3$. So suppose that $p \geq 5$ and note that

$$|G|/|C_G(x)|^2 \geq q^{24}(q^{12}-1)(q^8-1)(q^6-1)(q^2-1)/(q+1)^8,$$

which is at least q^{38} for $q \geq 2$. It is clear from Table 12 that (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample in this case either.

15. ${}^2F_4(2^a)'$, WHERE a IS ODD

Suppose that $a > 1$. Since $p \neq 2$, x is semisimple . If x is contained in a parabolic subgroup then Lemma 6 can be applied. If the resulting subgroup is an end node parabolic subgroup then it will be of type ${}^2B_2(2^a)$ in which case (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. If P is not an end

X_i	Bound on $\lvert x^G \cap X_i\rvert$	Cruder Bound
$d.(L(2,q) \times U(6,q).de$	0	
$e.(U(3,q)^3.e^2.S_3$	0	0
$f.L(3,q^2) \times L(3,q).g.2$	0	
$U(3,q^3).(e \times 3)$	0	
$d^2.(P\Omega^+(8,q) \times (q+1/d)^2).d^2.S_3$	$(q+1)^2$	
$({}^3D_4(q) \times (q^2-q+1)).3$	(q^2-q+1)	
$h.(P\Omega^-(10,q) \times (q+1/h)).h$	$(q+1)$	q^2
$(q+1)^6.W(E_6)$, $q \geq 5$	$(q+1)^6.51840$	q^{14}
$(q^2-q+1)^3.3^{1+2}SL(2,3)$	$(q^2-q+1)^3$	q^6
$3^{3+3}.SL(3,3)$	0	

Table 10. Bounds on $|x^G \cap X_i|$ for subgroups X_i of ${}^2E_6(q)$, $p \geq 5$. $d = (2, q-1)$, $e = (3, q+1)$, $f = (3, q-1)$, $g = (3, q^2-1)$, $h = (4, q+1)$

Representative in $F_4(3)$	Roots generating subsystem	Subsystem type
$x_1 = x_{1+2}(1)$ [a]	$1, 1+3$	$A_2(3)$
$x_2 = x_{1-2}(1)x_{1+2}(-1)$	$1-2, 2-3, 3-4, 4$	$B_4(3)$
$x_3 = x_{1-2}(1)x_{1+2}(-\eta)$	$1-2, 2-3, 3-4, 4$	$B_4(3)$
$x_4 = x_2(1)x_{3+4}(1)$	$2-3, 3-4, 4$	$B_3(3)$
$x_5 = x_{2-3}(1)x_4(1)x_{2+3}(1)$	$2-3, 3-4, 4$	$B_3(3)$
$x_6 = x_{2-3}(1)x_4(1)x_{2+3}(\eta)$	$2-3, 3-4, 4$	$B_3(3)$
$x_7 = x_2(1)x_{1-2+3+4}(1)$	$2, 1-2+3+4$	$A_2(3)$
$x_8 = x_{2-3}(1)x_4(1)x_{1-2}(1)$	$2-3, 1-2, 4$	$A_2(3)A_1(3)$
$x_{11} = x_{2+3}(1)x_{1+2-3-4}(1)x_{1-2+3+4}(1)$	$2+3, 1+2-3-4, 1-2+3+4$	$A_1(3)A_2(3)$

---

[a] In this case, x is a long root element in $A_2(3)$ and so there exist g_1, g_2 such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2}\rangle$ is not solvable

Table 11. Conjugacy class representatives in $F_4(3)$

node parabolic then the Levi complement will be of type $A_1(2^{2a})$ so (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample in this case either. So suppose that x is not contained in any parabolic subgroups. Then $p \geq 5$, by the same argument as for $F_4(q)$, and

$$|G|/|C_G(x)|^2 \geq q^{12}(q^6+1)(q^4-1)(q^3+1)(q-1)/2(q+1)^8.$$

This is at least q^{15} for $q \geq 8$. The maximal subgroups are given in [Mal91] and include the calculations in Table 13.

Thus (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample for $q \geq 8$. If $a = 1$ then $q = 2$ and the possibilities for the order of x are 3,5, and 13. There are unique classes of cyclic subgroups of order 3, 5, and 13, by [CCN$^+$85], thus a conjugate of x is contained in a subgroup isomorphic to $PSL(2, 25)$. So (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample in this case either.

The only outer automorphisms are field automorphisms. If x is a field automorphism then x normalizes an end node parabolic subgroup and acts non-trivially on the Levi complement. Therefore, (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

Type of X_i in G with $G_0 = F_4(q)$	Bound on $\lvert x^G \cap X_i \rvert$
$2.(L(2,q) \times PSp(6,q)).2$, q odd	0
$d.\Omega(9,q)$, $(2,q_0)$ classes	0
$d^2.P\Omega^+(8,q).S_3$, $(2,q_0)$ classes	0
${}^3D_4(q).3$ $(2,p)$ classes	0
$e.(L^\epsilon(3,q) \times L^\epsilon(3,q)).e.2$, $\epsilon = +1$	e^2
$e.(L^\epsilon(3,q) \times L^\epsilon(3,q)).e.2$, $\epsilon = -1$	e^2
$(Sp(4,q) \times Sp(4,q)).2$	0
$Sp(4,q^2).2$	0
$(q-1)^4.W(F_4)$, $q = 2^a$, $a > 2$	q^8
$(q+1)^4.W(F_4)$, $q = 2^a$, $a > 1$	q^{11}
$(q^2+q+1)^2.(3 \times SL(2,3))$, $q = 2^a$	q^6
$(q^2-q+1)^2.(3 \times SL(2,3))$, $q = 2^a$, $a > 1$	q^6
$(q^2+1)^2.(\mathbb{Z}_{30} \circ GL(2,3))$, $q = 2^a$, $a > 1$	q^9
$(q^4-q^2+1).\mathbb{Z}_{30}$, $q = 2^a$, $a > 1$	q^7
$3^3.SL(3,3)$, $q_0 \geq 5$	0

TABLE 12. Bounds on $|x^G \cap X_i|$ for subgroups X_i of $F_4(q)$, $p \geq 5$. $d = (2, q-1)$, $e = (3, q-\epsilon)$

Type of X_i in G with $G_0 = {}^2F_4(q)$	Bound on $\lvert x^G \cap X_i \rvert$
$SU(3,q).2$	0
$PGU(3,q).2$	0
$({}^2B_2(q) \times {}^2B_2(q)).2$	0
$Sp(4,q).2$	0
$B_2(q) : 2$	0
${}^2F_4(q_0)$	0
$(q+1)^2.GL(2,3)$	q^4
$(q+\sqrt{2q}+1)^2.(\mathbb{Z}_4 \circ GL(2,3))$	q^4
$(q-\sqrt{2q}+1)^2.(\mathbb{Z}_4 \circ GL(2,3))$, $q > 8$	q^2
$(q^2+\sqrt{2q^3}+q+\sqrt{2q}+1).\mathbb{Z}_{12}$	q^5
$(q^2-\sqrt{2q^3}+q-\sqrt{2q}+1).\mathbb{Z}_{12}$	q^2

TABLE 13. Bounds on $|x^G \cap X_i|$ for subgroups X_i of ${}^2F_4(q)$, $p \geq 5$. $d = (2, q-1)$, $e = (3, q-\epsilon)$

16. $G_2(q)$

Observe that, since $G_2(2)' \cong PSU(3,3)$, it suffices to assume that $q \neq 2$. First consider the case where q is a power of 2; so in particular, x is semisimple. The algebraic group G_2 fixes a non-degenerate quadratic form by [SS97, 4.1] and [LSS96] for example. It follows that any element of G_0 is conjugate to an element of either $SL_3(q) : 2$ or $SU(3,q) : 2$. Either x is non-central in one of these groups, in which case (x, G) is not a minimal counterexample, or x is central in $SL^\epsilon(3,q)$, and therefore is contained in a parabolic subgroup P. In the latter case, applying Lemma 6 implies that it suffices to assume that x acts non-centrally on the Levi complement, which is of type $A_1(q)$. So (x, G) is not a minimal counterexample in this case either.

Type of X_i in G with $G_0 = {}^3D_4(q)$	Bound on $\lvert x^G \cap X_i\rvert$
$G_2(q)$	0
$PGL^\epsilon(3,q)$, $q \equiv \epsilon \pmod 3$	0
${}^3D_4(q_1)$, $q_1^\alpha = q$, $\alpha \neq 3$ prime	0
$L(2,q^3) \times L(2,q), q_0 = 2$	0
$(SL(2,q^3) \circ SL(2,q)).2$, $q_0 \neq 2$	0
$((q^2+q+1) \circ SL(3,q)).(3,q^2+q+1).2$	q^3
$((q^2-q+1) \circ SU(3,q)).(3,q^2-q+1).2$	q^2
$(q^2+q+1)^2.SL(2,3)$	$(q+1)^4$
$(q^2-q+1)^2.SL(2,3)$	q^4
$(q^4-q^2+1).4$	q^4

Table 14. Bounds on $|x^G \cap X_i|$ for subgroups X_i of ${}^3D_4(q)$, $q \geq 4$, and $p \geq 5$. $d = (2, q-1)$, $e = (3, q-\epsilon)$, $f = (3, q^2+\epsilon q+1)$

Now suppose that q is odd. If x is semisimple then, since it has odd order, it must be contained in $SL^\epsilon(3,q)$ for either $\epsilon = +$ or $\epsilon = -$. Thus if x is not a central element in this subgroup then (x,G) is not a minimal counterexample. If x is central in the $SL^\epsilon(3,q)$ then x is contained in a parabolic subgroup P. So by Lemma 6, it suffices to assume that x acts non-centrally on the Levi complement, which is of type $A_1(q)$. Since $p \mid q-\epsilon$ and q is odd, it follows that $q \geq 5$ and (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample in this case either. Similarly, if x is unipotent and $q \neq 3$ then Lemma 6 implies that x acts non-trivially on a $A_1(q)$ Levi component of a parabolic subgroup.

Suppose that $q = 3 = p$ and that x is not a root element. It is easily verified using MAGMA that there are two conjugacy classes of elements of order 3 (long root elements and short root elements) that belong in Table 1. Moreover, in these cases, there exist $g_1, g_2 \in G_2(3)$ such that $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2}\rangle$ is not solvable.

17. ${}^3D_4(q)$

One can use MAGMA for the cases $q = 2$ and $q = 3$, so assume from now on that $q \geq 4$. If x is unipotent then, by Lemma 6, it suffices to assume that x acts non-centrally on a Levi component of a parabolic subgroup of type $A_1(q)$, or $A_1(q^3)$. So, since $q \geq 4$, (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. Similarly, if x is semisimple and is contained in a parabolic subgroup then Lemma 6 applies, as in the unipotent case. So it suffices to assume that x is not contained in any parabolic subgroups. It follows that $C_G(x)$ is a torus and $|C_G(x)| \leq (q+1)^4$ by [Sei83]. Thus,

$$\frac{|G|}{|C_G(x)|^2} \geq \frac{q^{12}(q^8+q^4+1)(q^6-1)(q^2-1)}{(q+1)^8},$$

which is at least q^{18} for $q \geq 4$. As usual, observe that $p \geq 5$ by [GLS98]. The possible maximal subgroups containing x can be deduced from [Kle88b] and are listed in Table 14 and Lemma 5 shows that (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

18. ${}^2B_2(2^a)$, $a \neq 1$ ODD

If $a = 1$ then ${}^2B_2(2^a)$ is solvable, so it suffices to assume that $a \neq 1$. The maximal subgroups are described in [Suz62] and are listed in Table 15. Note that $|G| = q^2(q^2+1)(q-1)$ where $q = 2^a$. Also, observe that $p \nmid q$ since p is odd and it suffices to assume that the only subfield subgroup that can contain x is ${}^2B_2(2)$, since otherwise (x,G) would not be a minimal counterexample. By [Suz62, Theorem 4], for example, any element of odd order in ${}^2B_2(q)$ has its centralizer contained in one of

Subgroup	Bound on $\lvert x^G \cap M\rvert$	Comments
H	$q^2(q-1)$	Borel subgroup
$D_{2(q-1)}$	$2(q-1)$	maximal rank
$N(A_1)$	$4(q+\sqrt{2q}+1)$	maximal rank
$N(A_2)$	$4(q-\sqrt{2q}+1)$	maximal rank
${}^2B_2(2^{a/b}), b \mid a,$	$q^{2/b}(q^{2/b}+1)(q^{1/b}-1)$	One class [Suz62, Theorem 10]

TABLE 15. Maximal subgroups of ${}^2B_2(2^a)$

the cyclic groups of order $q-1, q+\sqrt{2q}+1$ and $q-\sqrt{2q}+1$. So there are three mutually exclusive possibilities for p: $p \mid q-1$, $p \mid q+\sqrt{2q}+1$, and $p \mid q-\sqrt{2q}+1$. If $p \mid q-1$ then

$$|G|/|C_G(x)|^2 \geq q^2(q^2+1)(q-1)/(q-1)^2$$

and

$$\sum_i |x^G \cap X_i| \leq q^2(q-1)+2(q-1)+|{}^2B_2(2)|.$$

An elementary calculation shows that since $q \geq 8$

$$|G|/|C_G(x)|^2 > \sum_i |x^G \cap X_i|$$

and Lemma 5 applies. Similarly if $p \mid q \pm \sqrt{2q}+1$ then

$$\sum_i |x^G \cap X_i| \leq 4(q^2 \pm \sqrt{2q}+1)+|{}^2B_2(2)|$$

and the hypotheses of Lemma 5 are satisfied. Thus, (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

If x is an outer automorphism then it must be a field automorphism and the same counting argument as for $PSL(2, q)$ applies. Observe that it suffices to assume that there are no subfield subgroups among the H_i's except ${}^2B_2(q_0) = C_{G_0}(x)$. If there were, then x would be contained in $\mathrm{Aut}({}^2\mathrm{B}_2(\mathrm{q}^{1/\mathrm{r}}))$ for some prime $r \neq p$ and (x, G) would not be a minimal counterexample. So

$$|G_0|/|C_{G_0}(x)|^2 = q^2(q^2+1)(q-1)/q_0^4(q_0^2+1)^2(q_0-1)^2$$

and

$$1+\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{|H_i|}{|C_{H_i}(x)|^2} \leq 1+\frac{q^2(q-1)}{q_0^4(q_0-1)^2}+\frac{2(q-1)}{(q_0-1)^2}+ \frac{4(q+\sqrt{2q}+1)}{(q_0+\sqrt{2q_0}+1)^2}+\frac{4(q-\sqrt{2q}+1)}{(q_0-\sqrt{2q_0}+1)^2}.$$

A computation shows that the required inequality holds for all $q \geq 2^3$ and all $p \geq 3$.

19. ${}^2G_2(3^a)$, $a \neq 1$ ODD

Observe that if $a = 1$ then ${}^2G_2'(3) \cong L(2, 8)$ so suppose that $a \neq 1$. Also, $|G| = q^3(q^3+1)(q-1)$ and the maximal subgroups are given in [Kle88a], which are listed in Table 16. If $p \nmid q = 3^a$ then are there three mutually exclusive possibilities: $p \mid (q^2-1)$, $p \mid q-\sqrt{3q}+1$, and $p \mid q+\sqrt{3q}+1$. First suppose that $p \mid q^2-1$. Then a Sylow p-subgroup is contained inside a maximal subgroup $2 \times PSL(2, q)$, so some conjugate of x is contained in $PSL(2, q)$. Thus, (x, G) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

If $p \mid q^2-q+1$ then a Sylow p-subgroup is contained in one of the abelian Hall subgroups of order $q \pm \sqrt{3q}+1$, so it suffices to assume that x is contained in one of these Hall subgroups and

Subgroup	Comments
$P = [q^3].(q-1)$	Borel subgroup, only one class
$2 \times L(2,q), q \geq 27$	maximal rank
$(2^2 \times D_{(q+1)/2}) : 3, q \geq 27$	maximal rank
$\mathbb{Z}_{q+\sqrt{3q}+1} : \mathbb{Z}_6$	maximal rank
$\mathbb{Z}_{q-\sqrt{3q}+1} : \mathbb{Z}_6, q \geq 27$	maximal rank
${}^2G_2(q_0), q = q_0^\alpha, \alpha$ prime	

TABLE 16. Maximal subgroups of ${}^2G_2(3^a)$

that $|C_G(x)| = q \pm \sqrt{3q} + 1$ (see part (4) of the main theorem in [War66]). Then an easy count shows that the hypotheses of Lemma 5 are satisfied. If $p \mid q$ then [War66] shows that there are three conjugacy classes of elements of order $p = 3$. One class contains elements in the center of a Sylow 3-subgroup and these elements have centralizers of order q^3. The other two conjugacy classes have centralizers of order $2q^2$. Elements in these classes centralize an involution w, so they are contained in $C_G(w) \cong L(2,q) \times 2$ and so (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample in this case. Now [Law95] gives a representative $x_{2a+b}(1)x_{3a+2b}(1)$ for the conjugacy class of elements t with $|C_G(t)| = q^3$. This is contained in ${}^2G_2(3) \cong L(2,8) : 3$, so (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample in this case either. If x is an outer automorphism then it must be a field automorphism. The same method as for ${}^2B_2(2^a)$ applies here. As before, it suffices to assume that there are no subfield subgroups among the H_i's, other than ${}^2B_2(2^{a/p})$. So

$$|G_0|/|C_{G_0}(x)|^2 = q^3(q^3+1)(q-1)/q_0^6(q_0^3+1)^2(q_0-1)^2$$

and

$$1 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{|H_i|}{|C_{H_i}(x)|^2} \leq 1 + \frac{q^3(q-1)}{q_0^6(q_0-1)^2} + \frac{6(q+1)}{(q_0+1)^2} + \frac{6(q+\sqrt{3q}+1)}{(q_0+\sqrt{3q_0}+1)^2} + \frac{6(q-\sqrt{3q}+1)}{(q_0-\sqrt{3q_0}+1)^2} + \frac{2q(q^2-1)}{q_0^2(q_0^2-1)^2}.$$

A computation now shows that (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample for any prime power q.

20. SPORADIC GROUPS

If G_0 is one of the following sporadic groups then a MAGMA calculation shows that there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ is not solvable:

$$M_{11}, M_{12}, M_{22}, M_{23}, M_{24}, J_1, J_2, J_3, Co_2,$$
$$Co_3, McL, HS, Suz, He, Fi_{22}, Fi_{23}, Fi_{24}.$$

There are 9 remaining sporadic groups, which are a little more awkward. One can use [CCN+85], which describes the conjugacy classes and maximal subgroups. In certain circumstance, one can show that some element of a conjugacy class is contained inside some smaller almost simple group. In particular, one can do this if there is a unique conjugacy class of elements of order p, or a multiple of p that powers up to the conjugacy class in question. Then any almost simple subgroup containing elements of this order will contain an element of x^G, and thus (x,G) cannot be a minimal counterexample. Clearly, this also applies if all of the conjugacy classes of elements of order p are powers of each other. In the remaining cases, one can use MAGMA with a little more care. The details are listed in Tables 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

This completes the proof of Theorem A*.

Class(es)	MAGMA	x contained in "" due to power up
3		$M_{22}:2,3$
5		$M_{22}:2,\ 5$
7		$M_{22}:2,\ 7$ [a]
11A		$PSU(3,11):2,44$
11B		$\langle x,a\rangle$ generates[b]
23		$2^{11}:M_{24},23$
29		$\langle x,a\rangle$ generates[c]
31		$L(2,32),\ 31$
37		$U(3,11),\ 37$
43		$\langle x,a\rangle$ generates[d]

Table 17. Janko group, J_4

---

[a] $7A=(7B)^3$, $7B=7A^3$

[b] In this case, a is a standard generator in class 2A; x is a standard representative for class 11B; x^3a has order 43 and x^2a has order 35, so $\langle x,a\rangle$ cannot be contained in any maximal subgroups

[c] In this case, x is a standard representative for class 29A. We can show in MAGMA that the group order is a multiple of 29.44

[d] In this case, x is a standard representative for class 43A; but a calculation in MAGMA shows that 43.23 divides the order of $\langle x,a\rangle$

Class(es)	MAGMA	x contained in "" due to power up
3	done	
5	done	
7A		$A_9,42$
7B	done	
11		$Co_3,11$
13		$3:Suz:2,13$
23		$Co_2,23$

Table 18. Conway group, Co_1

Class(es)	MAGMA	x contained in "" due to power up
3	done	
5	done	
7		$A_8,7$
13		$PSL(2,13),13$
29		$PSL(2,29),29$

Table 19. Rudvalis group, Ru

References

[ABN+] Rachel Abbott, John Bray, Simon Nickerson, Steve Linton, Simon Norton, Richard Parker, Ibrahim Suleiman, Jonathan Tripp, Peter Walsh, and Robert Wilson, *A www-atlas of finite group representations.*

Class(es)	MAGMA	x contained in ”” due to power up
3	done	
5		$A_7, 5$
7A		$PSL(3,7), 14$
7B	done	
11		$J_1, 11$
19		$J_1, 19$
31		$PSL(2,31)$

Table 20. O’Nan group, $O'N$

Class(es)	MAGMA	x contained in ”” due to power up
3A		A_{12},21A
3B		A_{12}, 9
5A		A_{12}, 35
5B-E	done [a]	
7		$A_{12}, 7$
11		$A_{12}, 11$
19		$PSU(3,8), 19$

Table 21. Harada–Norton group, HN

---

[a] MAGMA calculation performed using permutation representation in [ABN$^+$]

Class(es)	MAGMA	x contained in ”” due to power up
3A		$2.A_{11}$,21A
3B		$2.A_{11}$, 9
5A		$2.A_{11}$, 20
5B	done [a]	
7		$2.A_{11}, 7$
11		$2.A_{11}, 11$
31		$5^3.PSL(3,5), 31$
37	done [b]	
67	done [c]	

Table 22. Lyons group, Ly

---

[a] If a and x are standard representatives for classes 2A and 5B respectively then ax^b has order 67 so $\langle a, x^b \rangle$ can not be contained in any maximal subgroup

[b] If a and x are standard representatives for classes 2A and 37A respectively then ax has order 67 so $\langle a, x \rangle$ can not be contained in any maximal subgroup

[c] If a and x are standard representatives for classes 2A and 67A respectively then ax has order 14 so $\langle a, x \rangle$ can not be contained in any maximal subgroup

[AG84] M. Aschbacher and R. Guralnick, *Some applications of the first cohomology group*, J. Algebra **90** (1984), no. 2, 446–460. MR MR760022 (86m:20060)

[Bur04] Timothy C. Burness, *Fixed point spaces in actions of classical algebraic groups*, J. Group Theory **7** (2004), no. 3, 311–346. MR MR2063000 (2005c:14054)

Class(es)	MAGMA	x contained in "" due to power up
3A		$PSU(3,8)$, 21
3B		A_9, 9
3C		A_9, 15
5		A_9, 5
7		A_9, 7
13		$PSL(3,3)$, 13
19		$PSL(2,19)$,19
31		$2^5.PSL(5,2)$, 31

TABLE 23. Thompson Group, Th

Class(es)	MAGMA	x contained in "" due to power up
3A		$HN, 21$
3B		$HN, 9$
5A		$HN, 35$
5B		HN, [a]
7		$PSL(2,49)$, 7
11		$PSL(2,11)$, 11
13		$PSL(3,3)$, 13
17		$PSL(2,17)$, 17
19		$HN, 19$
23		$FI_{23}, 23$
31		$PSL(2,31)$, 31
47	done [b]	

TABLE 24. Baby Monster, B

---

[a] The order of $C_B(x)$ is a multiple of 5^6, but $5^5 \nmid C_B(y)$ if $y \in 5A$, so any member of the class 5B in HN (centralizer order $500,000$) must be in the Baby Monster class 5B

[b] Since ax has order 9, where a and x are standard representatives for classes 2A and 47A respectively, $\langle a, x\rangle$ generates since the only maximal subgroup with order a multiple of 47 is $47 : 23$

[CCN+85] J. H. Conway, R. T. Curtis, S. P. Norton, R. A. Parker, and R. A. Wilson, *Atlas of finite groups*, Oxford University Press, Eynsham, 1985, Maximal subgroups and ordinary characters for simple groups, With computational assistance from J. G. Thackray. MR MR827219 (88g:20025)

[Enn62] Veikko Ennola, *On the conjugacy classes of the finite unitary groups*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I No. **313** (1962), 13. MR MR0139651 (25 #3082)

[FGG] Paul Flavell, Robert Guralnick, and Simon Guest, *Characterizations of the solvable radical*, Preprint, available at http://arXiv.org.

[GGKP08a] Nikolai Gordeev, Fritz Grunewald, Boris Kunyavskii, and Eugene Plotkin, *A commutator description of the solvable radical of a finite group*, Groups Geom. Dyn. **2** (2008), no. 1, 85–120. MR MR2367209 (2008j:20057)

[GGKP08b] ———, *A description of Baer–Suzuki type of the solvable radical of a finite group*, J. Pure and Applied Algebra, to appear (2008).

[GHL+96] Meinolf Geck, Gerhard Hiss, Frank Lübeck, Gunter Malle, and Götz Pfeiffer, *CHEVIE—a system for computing and processing generic character tables*, Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput. **7** (1996), no. 3, 175–210, Computational methods in Lie theory (Essen, 1994). MR MR1486215 (99m:20017)

[GK00] Robert M. Guralnick and William M. Kantor, *Probabilistic generation of finite simple groups*, J. Algebra **234** (2000), no. 2, 743–792, Special issue in honor of Helmut Wielandt. MR MR1800754 (2002f:20038)

Class(es)	$\lvert C_G(x)\rvert$	x contained in ”” due to power up
3A		$B, 48$
3B		$A_{12}, 9$
3C		$PSU(3,8) \times A_5, 57$
5A		$PSL(2,11) \times M_{12}, 55$
5B		$PSL(2,25), 25$
7A		$(A_5 \times A_{12}), 105$
7B		contained in $PSL(2,71)$ group by [NW02, pg 596]
11		$2.B, 11$
13A	73008	$S_3 \times Th$ [a]
13B	52728	Lies in $6.Suz$ by [NW02, pg 593]
17		$2.B, 17$
19		$2.B, 19$
23		$2.B, 23$
29		$3.Fi_{24}, 29$
31		$2.B, 31$
41		$3^8.O^-(8,3), 41$
47		$2.B, 47$
59		$PSL(2,59), 59$
71		$PSL(2,71), 71$

TABLE 25. Monster Group, M

---

[a] Since an element of order 13 in Th has centralizer order 39, it follows that any such element is in 13A since 39.6 divides $|C_G(x)|$ but does not divide 52728.

[GL83] Daniel Gorenstein and Richard Lyons, *The local structure of finite groups of characteristic* 2 *type*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **42** (1983), no. 276, vii+731. MR MR690900 (84g:20025)

[GLS98] Daniel Gorenstein, Richard Lyons, and Ronald Solomon, *The classification of the finite simple groups. Number 3.*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 40, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998. MR MR1490581 (98j:20011)

[GPPS99] Robert Guralnick, Tim Penttila, Cheryl E. Praeger, and Jan Saxl, *Linear groups with orders having certain large prime divisors*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **78** (1999), no. 1, 167–214. MR MR1658168 (99m:20113)

[GPS07] Robert Guralnick, Eugene Plotkin, and Aner Shalev, *Burnside-type problems related to solvability*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **17** (2007), no. 5-6, 1033–1048. MR MR2355682 (2008j:20110)

[GS03] Robert M. Guralnick and Jan Saxl, *Generation of finite almost simple groups by conjugates*, J. Algebra **268** (2003), no. 2, 519–571. MR MR2009321 (2005f:20057)

[Gur98] Robert M. Guralnick, *Some applications of subgroup structure to probabilistic generation and covers of curves*, Algebraic groups and their representations (Cambridge, 1997), NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., vol. 517, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1998, pp. 301–320. MR MR1670777 (2000d:20062)

[KL90] Peter Kleidman and Martin Liebeck, *The subgroup structure of the finite classical groups*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 129, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. MR MR1057341 (91g:20001)

[Kle88a] Peter B. Kleidman, *The maximal subgroups of the Chevalley groups* $G_2(q)$ *with q odd, the Ree groups* ${}^2G_2(q)$*, and their automorphism groups*, J. Algebra **117** (1988), no. 1, 30–71. MR MR955589 (89j:20055)

[Kle88b] ———, *The maximal subgroups of the Steinberg triality groups* ${}^3D_4(q)$ *and of their automorphism groups*, J. Algebra **115** (1988), no. 1, 182–199. MR MR937609 (89f:20024)

[Law95] R. Lawther, *Jordan block sizes of unipotent elements in exceptional algebraic groups*, Comm. Algebra **23** (1995), no. 11, 4125–4156. MR MR1351124 (96h:20084)

[LS03] Martin W. Liebeck and Gary M. Seitz, *A survey of maximal subgroups of exceptional groups of Lie type*, Groups, combinatorics & geometry (Durham, 2001), World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2003, pp. 139–146. MR MR1994964 (2004f:20089)

[LSS92] Martin W. Liebeck, Jan Saxl, and Gary M. Seitz, *Subgroups of maximal rank in finite exceptional groups of Lie type*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **65** (1992), no. 2, 297–325. MR MR1168190 (93e:20026)

[LSS96] ———, *Factorizations of simple algebraic groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **348** (1996), no. 2, 799–822. MR MR1316858 (96g:20064)

[Mal91] Gunter Malle, *The maximal subgroups of* ${}^2F_4(q^2)$, J. Algebra **139** (1991), no. 1, 52–69. MR MR1106340 (92d:20068)

[Miz77] Kenzo Mizuno, *The conjugate classes of Chevalley groups of type* E_6, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **24** (1977), no. 3, 525–563. MR MR0486170 (58 #5951)

[Miz80] ———, *The conjugate classes of unipotent elements of the Chevalley groups* E_7 *and* E_8, Tokyo J. Math. **3** (1980), no. 2, 391–461. MR MR605099 (82m:20046)

[NW02] Simon P. Norton and Robert A. Wilson, *Anatomy of the Monster. II*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **84** (2002), no. 3, 581–598. MR MR1888424 (2003b:20023)

[Sei83] Gary M. Seitz, *The root subgroups for maximal tori in finite groups of Lie type*, Pacific J. Math. **106** (1983), no. 1, 153–244. MR MR694680 (84g:20085)

[Sho74] Toshiaki Shoji, *The conjugacy classes of Chevalley groups of type* (F_4) *over finite fields of characteristic* $p \neq 2$, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **21** (1974), 1–17. MR MR0357641 (50 #10109)

[SS97] Jan Saxl and Gary M. Seitz, *Subgroups of algebraic groups containing regular unipotent elements*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **55** (1997), no. 2, 370–386. MR MR1438641 (98m:20057)

[Suz62] Michio Suzuki, *On a class of doubly transitive groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **75** (1962), 105–145. MR MR0136646 (25 #112)

[Tho68] John G. Thompson, *Nonsolvable finite groups all of whose local subgroups are solvable*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **74** (1968), 383–437. MR MR0230809 (37 #6367)

[Wal63] G. E. Wall, *On the conjugacy classes of classical groups*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. **3** (1963), 1–62. MR MR0150210 (27 #212)

[War66] Harold N. Ward, *On Ree's series of simple groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **121** (1966), 62–89. MR MR0197587 (33 #5752)

[Wie64] Helmut Wielandt, *Finite permutation groups*, Translated from the German by R. Bercov, Academic Press, New York, 1964. MR MR0183775 (32 #1252)

Department of Mathematics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089–2532
E-mail address: `sguest@usc.edu`